



TIIS
THE INSTITUTE
OF INTERNATIONAL
STUDIES



Assessment Policy and Procedure

The Institute of International Studies Pty Ltd

Sydney Campus: 13-15 Smail St, Ultimo NSW 2007

Melbourne Campus: Level 1, 112 Newquay Promenade, Docklands, VIC 3008

Tel: (+61 2) 8098 0702 | Email: info@tiis.edu.au

Policy No: AB-07

Version No: 1.2

Contents

Purpose.....	3
Scope.....	3
Definitions.....	3
Principles	3
Policy	3
1. Principles.....	3
2. Assessment	3
2.1 Use of Generative AI in Assessment	5
3. Submission of Assessment Tasks	5
4. Extension of Assessment Task Due Date	5
5. Late Submission.....	6
6. Supplementary Assessments	6
Responsibility.....	7
Procedure.....	7
1. Assessment Design	7
2. Information for Students.....	8
3. Due Dates, Extensions and Assessment Submissions	8
4. Academic Integrity.....	9
5. Accommodation of Special Needs in Assessments	10
6. Moderation of Assessments.....	10
7. Marking Scale.....	11
8. Finalising and Recording of Assessment Grades.....	12
9. Review of Marks, and Re-Marking of, Assessments	12
10. Appeal	14
APPENDIX A: External Moderation of Grades Template.....	15
Benchmark.....	16
Related Documents	16
External Legislation.....	16
Version History	16

Purpose

The purpose of this Policy is to outline unit assessment principles and processes at The Institute of International Studies (TIIS) Pty Ltd.

Scope

This policy applies to all students enrolled in, and all staff involved in the delivery of coursework units.

Definitions

Unless otherwise defined in this document, all capitalised terms are defined in the Glossary of Terms. For the purposes of this Policy, the following key terms apply:

Generative AI (GenAI): Artificial intelligence systems capable of generating text, images, code, or other content in response to prompts (e.g., ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini).

Authentic Assessment: Assessment tasks that require students to demonstrate knowledge and skills through real-world, applied, or contextually meaningful activities.

Reasonable Adjustment: A modification to assessment conditions or processes made to ensure equitable participation for students with disability, medical conditions, or other special needs, without compromising the integrity or learning outcomes of the assessment.

Supplementary Assessment: An additional and new assessment task, or tasks, offered to an eligible student who has marginally failed a unit, specifically designed and targeted to assess the learning outcome(s) not sufficiently demonstrated in the original assessment task(s) for the unit.

Principles

TIIS is committed to providing engaging, industry-relevant, and contemporary units at the appropriate Australian Qualification Framework (AQF) level.

Policy

1. Principles

The following principles apply to assessment at TIIS:

- Assessment practices must promote learning, evaluate outcomes, and facilitate reflection and judgement
- Assessment practices must be clearly communicated
- Assessment practices must be inclusive, valid and fair
- Assessment practices must be regularly reviewed
- Assessment practices must be integrated into program design
- Assessment practices must develop contemporary capabilities in a trustworthy way.

2. Assessment

Assessment is a vital part of the learning process, influencing student formation and development. TIIS's principles of assessment include:

- 2.1 Assessment will safeguard academic standards and the integrity of awards through adherence to internal policy and ethical standards, including the TIIS Code of Conduct.
- 2.2 Assessment is designed based on the principles of authentic assessment.
- 2.3 Assessment is designed in alignment with professional accreditation requirements where applicable. Such requirements will be monitored and reviewed according to TIIS internal quality assurance systems and processes, for the purpose of continuous improvement.
- 2.4 Assessment is criterion-referenced (not normative) and aligned to the unit and course learning outcomes and graduate attributes.
- 2.5 Assessment facilitates valid, reliable, and fair measurement and reporting of the level of student achievement of learning outcomes and graduate attributes.
- 2.6 Work-integrated-learning, such as practical placements, are assessed according to the stated learning outcomes aligned to this activity.
- 2.7 Assessment requirements, including marking criteria (rubric) explicitly outlining the standards to which the learning outcomes will be assessed, should be made available to students with each assessment task.
- 2.8 Guidelines and guardrails on the use of Generative AI tools will be explicitly covered in each unit's outline and on its LMS site – it will state whether the use of Generative AI tools are permitted or not permitted. If used when not permitted, it will be treated as academic misconduct. If permitted, the unit outline will define how Generative AI tools may be used, and any use outside of these parameters will be treated as academic misconduct. Staff are responsible for ensuring GenAI guidance is clearly communicated to students via the LMS prior to unit commencement.
- 2.9 When assessment requires students to consult physical and online texts or utilise Generative AI tools to research for information, appropriate referencing of these resources is required in accordance with the TIIS Style Guide.
- 2.10 Reasonable adjustments to assessment conditions and methods will be provided where appropriate to students with disability, medical conditions, or other special needs, to ensure equitable access without compromising the integrity of the assessment or learning outcomes.
- 2.11 Where appropriate, a variety of assessment tasks, including formative and summative tasks, will usually be provided to cater for various learning needs, as appropriate to the unit.
- 2.12 A minimum of two and a maximum of four assessment tasks per unit will usually apply.
- 2.13 Mapping of assessment due dates across the semester will be undertaken to ensure management of student workload.
- 2.14 Quality, timely, informative and constructive feedback and grading of assessment will usually be provided within a maximum of three weeks and before the next assessment is due.
- 2.15 Assessment and grading processes will be transparent as far as practicably possible.
- 2.16 Group work will usually be worth no more than 30% of the total assessment in a unit, unless specific learning outcomes for the unit require collaborative learning. If learning outcomes require group assessment, then no more than 50% is permissible.
- 2.17 Consideration will usually be given to the proportion of assessment conducted under controlled conditions (for example, examinations) to safeguard the integrity of assessment.
- 2.18 Attention will be given to minimising the possibility of breaches of academic integrity or misconduct as described in the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Framework.
- 2.19 Students must submit all assessment tasks to be eligible to pass a unit, on the basis that this is a requirement to demonstrate satisfactory achievement of unit learning outcomes. In exceptional circumstances (for example, serious medical emergencies), the Dean or delegate may grant a formal exemption from this requirement on a case-by-case basis, provided that the student has met all other substantive obligations. Non-submission without an approved exemption will result in a Fail (Non-submission) grade for the unit.

- 2.20 Staff should not be responsible for the assessment of student(s) with whom they have, or have had, a family, personal or other significant relationship.
- 2.21 A student has no automatic right to a remark, resubmission, or supplementary assessment task.

2.1 Use of Generative AI in Assessment

- 2.1.1 TIIS recognises that Generative AI (GenAI) tools are evolving rapidly and may be used in a range of contexts in higher education. This section sets out TIIS's approach to managing GenAI use in assessment to uphold academic integrity and ensure students develop genuine skills and capabilities.
- 2.1.2 Each unit will specify, in its outline and LMS site, whether GenAI tools are: (a) not permitted; (b) permitted with conditions (e.g., for specific tasks or stages only); or (c) permitted and encouraged. This specification must be made available to students at least two weeks prior to unit commencement.
- 2.1.3 Where GenAI use is permitted, students must cite and acknowledge all GenAI tools used in accordance with the TIIS Style Guide. Failure to appropriately acknowledge GenAI use where permitted constitutes academic misconduct.
- 2.1.4 Where GenAI use is permitted, students must apply significant original critical analysis, synthesis, and modification to any GenAI-generated content; verbatim or near-verbatim reproduction of GenAI output without transformation or attribution constitutes academic misconduct.
- 2.1.5 Unit Coordinators are responsible for ensuring assessments are designed to minimise reliance on GenAI tools and to require higher-order thinking skills (analysis, evaluation and creation) in line with the unit's AQF level. Refer to Appendix F – Approach to the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Learning and Assessment Activities in the Learning and Teaching Plan.
- 2.1.6 Penalties for misuse of GenAI in assessment will be applied in accordance with the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Procedure.

3. Submission of Assessment Tasks

Unit outlines shall contain clear and adequate instructions on how, where, and when assessment tasks are to be submitted. It is a student's responsibility to ensure that they submit assessments correctly and on time, according to instructions. Students are required to submit ALL assessment tasks in a unit in order to pass the unit. Every assessment task submitted should, in the view of the marker, be a serious attempt to meet the learning outcomes of the task, be the student's own work, and declared so each time.

4. Extension of Assessment Task Due Date

- 4.1 An extension of the assessment deadline may be granted on the following grounds, with supporting documentation as appropriate (for example, doctor's certificate, death certificate, or letter from a registered psychologist):
 - medical illness;
 - extreme hardship;
 - compassionate grounds;
 - faculty supervised project amendment;
- 4.2 Although the term 'compassionate grounds' allows some flexibility, such circumstances would usually involve significant disruptive circumstances. The Commonwealth Ombudsman's Assessing Compassionate or Compelling Circumstances document will guide how TIIS assesses such applications.
- 4.3 Unavoidable disruption

Where a student is prevented by an unavoidable disruption from both submitting an assessment or attending an invigilated exam, and applying for an extension prior to the

assessment deadline, the student shall report the circumstances in writing, with supporting documentation as appropriate, to the Program Director, as soon as practical (generally, by no later than seven days after the assessment deadline). Unavoidable disruption to studies is defined as resulting from an event or set of circumstances which:

- could not have reasonably been anticipated, avoided or guarded against by the student; and
- was beyond the student's control.

4.4 Work commitments, or activities associated with extending a visa or undertaking English language proficiency tests, are not considered unavoidable disruptions.

5. Late Submission

Students are expected to submit assessments by the due date. Students who do not submit assessments by the due date without an approved extension or unavoidable disruption are at risk of receiving a late penalty for that assessment. The standard late penalty is 10% of the maximum available mark for the assessment task per calendar day late. After 7 calendar days, a '0' (zero) will be recorded for that task. However, the student is still required to submit the task in order to pass the unit.

Variations of this penalty may be appropriate for units where the nature of the assessment warrants a different approach. Any such variation must be approved by the Dean or delegate, documented in the relevant unit outline, and communicated to students at least two weeks prior to unit commencement. The Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Procedure governs circumstances where non-submission relates to academic misconduct.

6. Supplementary Assessments

6.1 A supplementary assessment is an additional and new assessment task (or tasks) offered to an eligible student who has marginally failed a unit. There is no automatic right to receive a supplementary assessment task.

6.2 To be eligible for a supplementary assessment, all of the following criteria must be met:

- 6.2.1 The student must have a final composite mark of 45% to less than 50% for the unit;
- 6.2.2 All assessment tasks in the unit must have been submitted, and each submission must, in the view of the marker, represent a serious attempt to meet the learning outcomes of the task;
- 6.2.3 The student must have no outstanding financial liability to TIIS, or must be up to date with any approved payment plan;
- 6.2.4 The unit result must not be subject to an unresolved academic integrity or misconduct investigation.

Design of Supplementary Assessments

6.3.1 A supplementary assessment task must be specifically designed and targeted to assess the learning outcome(s) in which the student has not sufficiently demonstrated achievement in one or more of the assessment tasks for the unit.

6.3.2 The supplementary assessment must be sufficient in scope, depth, and rigour to enable the student to demonstrate achievement of the identified learning outcome(s) at the unit's AQF level. The task must be assessed against the same standards applied to the original assessment(s).

6.3.3 Provided it meets the requirements of 6.3.1 and 6.3.2, the form of the supplementary assessment is at the discretion of the Unit Coordinator, in consultation with the Program Director. Supplementary assessment may take many forms (for example, written task, examination, oral assessment, scenario-based simulation, or verbal defence) and will not always replicate the form of the original assessment task. Where an examination is set,

students should expect different questions from the original examination, provided the same learning outcomes are assessed.

6.3.4 The Unit Coordinator will set the supplementary task(s) and will advise the student in writing of the form the supplementary assessment will take, the learning outcome(s) being assessed, and the submission or sitting date.

6.4 If students meet the eligibility requirements in clause 6.2, they may apply for a supplementary assessment and pay the relevant fee.

6.5 A unit passed by supplementary assessment will be awarded a final mark of 50% and the grade Pass – Supplementary (P (S)), being the maximum result available where a supplementary assessment is granted.

6.6 Failure to submit the supplementary assessment by the required time, including failing to attend an in-person or scheduled assessment, will result in a mark of zero (0) being given for the supplementary assessment, and any fee paid will not be refunded. There is no extension or further assessment opportunity if the approved supplementary assessment is missed.

6.7 Only one supplementary assessment opportunity per unit enrolment will be permitted.

Responsibility

Dean

Procedure

1. Assessment Design

- 1.1 Assessment in a Unit is designed to enable students to demonstrate their level of achievement for Unit and Course learning outcomes and TIIS's Graduate Qualities.
- 1.2 The learning outcomes for different Units and Courses reflect the complexity of the knowledge base and the depth of achievement required at their respective AQF levels and will be assessed accordingly.
- 1.3 Each Unit will have a minimum of two and a maximum of four assessment tasks per unit, at least one of which must be a summative assessment task. This reflects the requirements of Policy 2.12.
- 1.4 Each unit may have up to 3 formative assessment tasks, designed to be completed within the standard workload of the study to provide students with feedback.
- 1.5 If any of the required assessments are not submitted, the final composite mark a student can receive for the Unit will be capped at 50% (irrespective of their final assessment mark and grade).
- 1.6 All assessment tasks are to be based on the principles of authentic assessment.
- 1.7 Assessments within Units and across the Course should comprise an appropriate mix of assessment tasks which could include projects, quizzes, essays, reports, oral presentations, scenario-based simulations, collaborative assessments (which may or may not be group tasks), forum posts, and reflective pieces.
- 1.8 Group work will usually be worth no more than 30% of the total assessment in a unit, unless specific learning outcomes for the unit require collaborative learning. Where learning outcomes require group assessment, no more than 50% of total unit assessment may be allocated to group work.
- 1.9 **Appendix D** Assessment Equivalence Table, in the Learning and Teaching Plan, details the various weighting requirements for each type of assessment, and reflects the level of the unit within each course.

- 1.10 Assessment tasks should have components that discriminate to assist in the identification of students who should be given a higher grade, for example, a Credit, Distinction, or High Distinction.
- 1.11 To maintain the integrity of assessments at TIIS, assessments in each unit within the Course will be designed and tested to ensure that they are not readily addressed by Generative AI tools. The approach taken should align with Appendix F – Approach to the use of artificial intelligence in learning and assessment activities in the Learning and Teaching Plan.
- 1.12 Marking rubrics must be provided for all assessments and must be applied by all markers to enhance the consistency of marking and quality of feedback. Rubrics must be made available to students in the two weeks before unit commencement, to inform their assessment preparation and communicate the expectations of the teaching team regarding the focus and relative emphasis in the assessment.
- 1.13 Assessment instructions must include clear guidance with regard to the appropriate use of Generative AI. Should Generative AI not be allowed to be used in an assessment, this will be clearly indicated in the assessment instructions.
- 1.14 Program Coordinators will provide a detailed assessment pack each teaching period for each assessment task to support student understanding of the assessment requirements.
- 1.15 Assessment diversity must be mapped across the whole course to ensure appropriate skill development, timing, sequencing, weighting, authenticity profile, and mix of assessments. This will ensure that across the course the balance of assessment design is appropriate.
- 1.16 Assessment submission and feedback will be planned to ensure students are provided timely feedback prior to undertaking the final assessment.

2. Information for Students

- 2.1 Details about each assessment task, the weighting for each assessment in any given Unit, including the due dates, assessment format, word limits (if applicable), time limits for oral presentations, marking criteria, and clear guidelines on the appropriate use of Generative AI for assessments must be set out in the Unit's pages on the LMS provided for the Unit and must be available to students at least two weeks prior to Unit commencement.
- 2.2 Students must comply with the writing and referencing conventions set out in the TIIS Style Guide, including declaring and appropriately acknowledging the use of Generative AI in their assessments.
- 2.3 Students must ensure that any AI tools are used in an appropriate, responsible, and ethical manner; students who use AI tools must be fully aware of the risks and limitations of AI; students must apply significant original critique and modification to the generated output.
- 2.4 Annotated assessment examples will be provided for each core unit by the relevant Unit Coordinator.
- 2.5 The final assessment in each Unit will usually require students to explicitly link unit content and theory with their professional context and experience, or a scenario-based simulation.

3. Due Dates, Extensions and Assessment Submissions

- 3.1 Students must submit the assessments for each unit by the due date and in the format stipulated in the LMS. If assessments are submitted in a format other than the one specified, they will not be marked.
- 3.2 Students who require an extension of time for the submission of an assessment task may apply in writing, stating the reason for the request and including supporting documentation:
 - a. Applications for extensions should be lodged through the Student Support Team at studentsupport@tiis.edu.au and must be submitted prior to the submission due date.
 - b. All extensions are granted at the sole discretion of TIIS. In cases of repeated extension requests, students may be offered alternative methods of assistance (for example, time management advice or academic skills assistance in lieu of an extension).

- c. An assessment will not be accepted (or resubmissions allowed) once the extension submission date has passed.
 - d. The maximum extension that a student can receive is 5 days.
- 3.3 Students with exceptional circumstances will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- 3.4 Where the assessment for the unit is received by TIIS after the due date and if no extension has been requested by the student, a penalty of 10% of the value of the task will be applied for each calendar day overdue. After 7 calendar days, a '0' (zero) will be recorded for that task. However, the student is still required to submit the task in order to pass the unit.
- 3.5 Resubmission of assessments is not normally permitted once the due date has passed. Exceptions may be considered at the discretion of the Dean or delegate in accordance with the circumstances set out in Section 9 (Review of Marks and Re-Marking of Assessments) of this Policy.
- 3.6 Assessments will be locked for marking once the final submission date has passed.
- 3.7 Where the assessment submission exceeds the specified word count by 10% or over, a penalty of up to 25% off the maximum mark available will be applied. Additionally, papers of excessive length:
 - a. Will not be read beyond the word limit (plus 10%); and
 - b. Will not receive feedback beyond the word limit (plus 10%).
- 3.8 For in class assessment activities, for example, oral presentations, in class quizzes, tutorial activities and self-reflection tasks, there will be no extensions permitted as they must be completed within the specified time/class.
- 3.9 Where the assessment submission has a specified time limit (for example, oral presentation), the submission will not be marked beyond the specified time limit.
- 3.10 No penalty is applied to assessments below the word count range (for example, written assessment) or time limit (for example, oral presentation); however, students should note that it may be challenging to demonstrate the required level of depth for a passing grade if the word count or specified time limit has not been met.

4. Academic Integrity

- 4.1 If students have plagiarised in an assessment or otherwise breached the Academic Integrity Policy, penalties will apply according to the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure. Remark requests for assessments that have been found to be in breach of the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure will not be accepted. For coursework-based courses refer to the Policy and Procedure on Academic Integrity for more details. For research courses refer to the Research Integrity Breach Management Procedure for more details.
- 4.2 To support the Academic Integrity of TIIS's assessment, a random selection of submitted final assessments in each Term requires students to present a verbal summary of the assessment and respond to several questions. The student must verbally demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the submitted assessment to validate that the work is their own. This information must be included in the Unit's site on the LMS for each Unit.
- 4.3 Students selected to present a verbal summary must attend, at the agreed time, the meeting with the Unit Coordinator (or nominee). Students who do not attend the verbal summary meeting will be awarded a zero for the assessment. Meetings will usually be held online and recorded.
- 4.4 Academic Staff may conduct verbal summary tests where Academic Integrity investigations indicate further analysis of submitted work is warranted. Students who do not attend the verbal summary meeting will be awarded zero for the assessment.
- 4.5 To ensure consistency and fairness in verbal summary assessments, a structured framework of at least three core questions directly related to the assessment content will be used. All verbal summary sessions will be recorded.
- 4.6 Students may request a rescheduling of a verbal summary session once, provided they supply valid evidence of an unavoidable disruption (as defined in Policy Section 4.3) within

24 hours of the original scheduled time. Approved rescheduling will be arranged within 5 working days.

- 4.7 Students who dispute the outcome of a verbal summary assessment may seek a review through the process set out in Section 9 (Review of Marks and Re-Marking of Assessments) of this Policy. Appeals on procedural grounds are available under the Complaints and Grievance Resolution Policy and Procedure.

5. Accommodation of Special Needs in Assessments

- 5.1 A student with special needs (including, for example, those with a disability, impairment, or medical condition) who seeks reasonable adjustments in their study or assessment methods because of that condition may make a request:
- a. in the case of a pre-existing condition, in the 'special needs' section of the application form, or
 - b. in the case of a condition occurring during a study period, in writing to Student Services (during the course of study).
- 5.2 If approved by the Registrar or nominee, any such reasonable adjustments will be confirmed in writing within 5 working days of receipt of the complete request. Reasonable adjustments may include but are not limited to extended time for assessments, alternative assessment formats, assistive technology, separate examination rooms, or modified submission requirements. Students with temporary impairments (for example, a broken arm or short-term illness immediately prior to an assessment) should contact Student Services as soon as practicable for consideration of appropriate adjustments.
- 5.3 Unit Coordinators will negotiate reasonable adjustments to assessments where students have been approved for consideration by the Registrar or nominee.

6. Moderation of Assessments

6.1 Standardisation. Prior to marking, for any assessment task marked by more than one marker, the Unit Coordinator must hold a standardisation (calibration) meeting using the marking rubric and, where available, sample or benchmark responses, to ensure markers share a consistent understanding of the standards expected at each grade level.

6.2 Following marking, the Unit Coordinator is responsible for internal moderation of assessment. Internal moderation must be completed within 10 working days of assessment closure and prior to the release of grades, and must review a moderation sample comprising: (a) a minimum of 10% of submissions for each assessment task, or 10 submissions, whichever is greater; (b) all Fail grades and all marks within 5 percentage points of a grade boundary, including the Supplementary Assessment eligibility band (45%–49%); and (c) a sample of High Distinction and Distinction grades.

6.3 Where moderation identifies a variance of 10% or more between the original and moderated view of a submission, or another material inconsistency, the Unit Coordinator must review and, where warranted, adjust the affected grade(s) prior to submission to the Board of Examiners, and document the rationale. Any unresolved or unit-wide inconsistency must be escalated to the Program Director and reported to the Learning and Teaching Committee.

6.4 Outcomes of moderation, including any adjustments and their rationale, must be documented and retained for a minimum of five years (or until the next scheduled course review, whichever is later), and incorporated into future assessment design to support continuous improvement.

6.5 For Units where the Unit Coordinator is the only Learning Facilitator, a separate moderator must be utilised. The separate moderator must hold discipline expertise equivalent to or higher than the Unit Coordinator and must not have taught or marked the cohort being moderated.

6.6 External moderation of grades is undertaken by an external academic with relevant expertise, on a rolling basis such that every unit is externally moderated at least once every three years,

prioritising newly developed or substantially revised units and units with historically high Fail or Supplementary Assessment rates.

- a. The Dean or delegate will nominate a sample of six units across specialisation areas each year to be submitted for external moderation, drawn from this rolling schedule.
- b. A selection of graded assessments for each compulsory assessment per unit will be identified for external moderation as follows: top (High Distinction and Distinction), middle (Credit and Pass), and bottom graded assessments (Fail).
- c. The Dean or delegate will identify and select relevant and qualified external academics to act as external moderators for each unit identified.
- d. The external moderator will be provided with the following:
 - i. All relevant documentation about the assessment in question, which may include but is not limited to, a description of the Unit, the assessment question, assessment criteria, solutions guide and any available information about standards expected for each range of marks; and
 - ii. Sample of graded assessments.
- e. External moderators are asked to review the graded assessments for academic standards, fairness, and consistency of marking (see Appendix A).
- f. External moderators will provide a Report for TIIS to review which includes:
 - i. Comments on the standards, fairness, and consistency of marking in the unit with respect to the relevant AQF level; and
 - ii. Any other relevant feedback relevant to the assessment at the prescribed AQF level.

7. Marking Scale

7.1 The following marking scale will apply for each unit:

Grade	Definition
High Distinction Code: HD Mark range: $\geq 85\%$	Outstanding work which exhibits sophisticated understanding and critical synthesis, analysis, and evaluation of the subject matter. While the work utilises opinions of others, judgements about the value of the subject matter are made and drawn together in an organised whole. Gaps in the subject matter might also be identified and the implications discussed.
Distinction Code: D Mark range: 75-84%	Substantial work of high quality, which demonstrates a clear understanding of the subject matter, in which the relationship between the constituent elements is identified clearly and discussed with some level of critical analysis. The work also applies abstract ideas in concrete situations.
Credit Code: C Mark range: 65-74%	Sound and competent work, which demonstrates a reasonable but incomplete grasp of the subject matter. Recall and paraphrase the work of others with little integration. Some basic levels of critical analysis is evident.
Pass Code: P Mark range: 50-64%	Work that demonstrates a satisfactory engagement with the subject matter such that the student is said to have a general understanding of the area of knowledge.
Pass - Supplementary Code: P (S) Mark range: 50%	Student passes the unit based on the successful undertaking of a supplementary assessment and was awarded a mark of 50%, the maximum given to a unit where a supplementary assessment is granted.
Non-graded Pass Code: NGP	Completion of an assessed task on a pass/fail basis.

Credit Granted for Prior Learning Code: CPL	Credit has been applied for and granted for prior learning.
Result Withheld Incomplete Code: RWI	Result to be finalised. This may be due to an ongoing student misconduct investigation, a pending deferred examination result (for example, offered due to illness or other unavoidable misfortune on the exam day) or due to a pending supplementary exam result (for example, offered for students achieving a mark of 45-49%). RWI converts to an FN if not resolved to a grade by the following teaching period.
Result Withheld Administrative Code: RWA	Student must resolve an issue with TIIS Administration before the grade is released.
Withdrew without Failure Code: WO	Withdrew from the unit before census date or after the census date with special circumstances.
Fail (Outright) Code: FO Mark range: < 50%	Attempted all or most of the assessments but did not meet key learning objectives of the unit.
Fail (Non-submission) Code: FN Mark range: <= 15%	Did not submit more than 15% of the total value of assessments.
Fail (Absent) Code: FN Mark range: 0%	Did not submit any assessment task and received 0% for the total value of assessments.
Withdrew with Failure Code: WF	Withdrew from the unit after the census date.

7.2 All fail grades will appear on the Academic Transcript. The Academic Transcript will also include a Grade Point Average (refer to procedure on Calculation of Grade Point Average).

8. Finalising and Recording of Assessment Grades

8.1 The final grade is an aggregate of the marks/grades for the various assessments.

8.2 Final grades and notations for units will not be deemed official until after the Moderation of Assessment grades by Unit Coordinators and after formal review by the Board of Examiners.

8.2.1 Timeframes for releasing grades and notations to students are:

- i. Assessment 1 – at least 10 days before the next assessment due date.
- ii. Assessment 2 and Final Unit Grade – normally within 10 days of the original assessment due date.

8.3 Final grades are formally recorded. Final grades and final notations can only be altered with the approval of the Dean or nominee.

9. Review of Marks, and Re-Marking of, Assessments

9.1 Failing an assessment and/or Unit

- a. All references to assessments shall be deemed to include all assessment tasks.
- b. If a student fails an assessment, they may:
 - i. obtain informal feedback from the Unit Coordinator;
 - ii. appeal for a re-mark (see section 10.1);
 - iii. re-enrol in the Unit and pay the relevant fees.
- c. Resubmission of an assessment is not normally permitted and will be considered only if all of the following requirements are met, at the discretion of the Dean or delegate:

- i. Final offerings of teach-out Units, or assessment is the final assessment; and
 - ii. The mark for the final assessment is between 45% and 49%; and
 - iii. The overall mark for the Unit without including the assessment task in question, is between 45% and 49% inclusive.
 - d. In the event of resubmission, and where the subsequent composite marks for all assessments (including the resubmission) are 50% or higher, the overall mark will be capped at 50% for the unit.
 - e. Only one resubmission per Unit enrolment will be allowed.
 - f. If the resubmission is not made by the stated time and date, no further resubmission will be permitted.
 - g. A student who is eligible for a supplementary assessment under Policy Section 6 may not also access resubmission under this clause 9.1(c) for the same unit enrolment; the student must elect one remediation pathway only.
- 9.2 High Level Feedback
- Students are entitled to request high level feedback from the Unit Coordinator on their assessments within the appeals period from the end date of the relevant term.
- 9.3 Re-mark
- a. Students are entitled to formally request a re-mark for an assessment within the appeals period after the release of the assessment grade. If a request (accompanied by a re-marking fee) is not made within this time, TIIS will not conduct the re-mark. Any fees paid after the cut-off date will be held in credit in accordance with the fees in credit policy.
 - b. Any formal re-mark request must be made in writing in the required form, specified in the relevant student handbook, and must include evidence why the student believes the grade was wrong or unfair. The Dean or delegate will determine if a re-mark is justified or not. If not, the student will be advised of the decision within five working days of receipt of the re-mark request. The Dean or delegate may determine whether re-marking is not justified in various circumstances including, but not limited to, Plagiarism or breach of the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure.
 - c. If the Dean or delegate allows the re-marking, independent re-marking by a person other than the original assessor ("the re-marker") shall be arranged within 10 working days of the re-mark approval. The re-marker may be from TIIS or from another institution but must have expertise in the area related to the assessment. The re-marker must declare any potential conflicts of interest prior to undertaking the re-mark; re-markers may not be current direct supervisors or close collaborators of the original marker. The re-marker must use their best endeavours to ensure that the re-marking is as independent as possible, and will be given:
 - i. all relevant documentation about the assessment in question, which may include but is not limited to a description of the Unit, the assessment question, assessment criteria, solutions guide and any available information about standards expected for each range of marks; and
 - ii. a clean copy of the student's work, where possible.

At this stage, the re-marker will not normally be given details of the student's original assessment, including the marks.
 - d. All re-marked assessments are subject to moderation when the re-marked assessment mark varies by 10% or more from the original assessment mark.
 - e. Summative feedback will be provided to the student with the re-marked assessment grade.
 - f. Only one re-mark for each assessment will be permitted. The re-marked grade will be the final grade, whether it is higher or lower than the original grade.
 - g. The re-mark fee may be refunded to the student if:

- i. the re-marked assessment mark is 10% or more than the original assessment mark; and
- ii. the overall Unit grade increases.

9.4 Fee-Help Eligible Students are required to pay the relevant re-marking fees; except for assessments they have failed.

10. Appeal

10.1 Students dissatisfied after following the re-marking process referred to above can submit a formal appeal/grievance in accordance with stage one as referred to in the Complaints and Grievance Resolution Policy and Procedure. Students should note that such an appeal may only be on the grounds that correct policies and procedures were not followed in carrying out the re-marking process (and the review of the appeal will not include a review of the assessment or Unit grade).

APPENDIX A: External Moderation of Grades Template

External Moderation of Grades Template	
Subject/Unit Code and Name	<i>To be pre-filled by provider seeking moderation</i>
Term and Year of Offering	<i>To be pre-filled by provider seeking moderation</i>
AQF Level	<i>To be pre-filled by provider seeking moderation</i>
Subject/Unit Coordinator	<i>To be pre-filled by provider seeking moderation</i>
Subject/Unit Learning Outcome 1	<i>To be pre-filled by provider seeking moderation</i>
Subject/Unit Learning Outcome 2	<i>To be pre-filled by provider seeking moderation</i>
Subject/Unit Learning Outcome 3	<i>To be pre-filled by provider seeking moderation</i>
Subject/Unit Learning Outcome 4	<i>To be pre-filled by provider seeking moderation</i>

Add additional rows if needed

<i>Name and Title of Moderator</i>	
<i>Position and Institution</i>	
<i>Date of Moderation</i>	

Based on your review of the sample of marked assessments, please provide a response to the following questions:

Section 1: Mark Allocation and Feedback Quality

<i>The marks awarded for assessments are consistent with that expected at the appropriate AQF level.</i>	Yes	Yes, but	No, but	No
Comment:				
Provider Response:				
<i>Feedback is constructive, consistent, usable, utilises rubrics and is provided either in writing or orally (recorded). Please consider whether the markers' comments were sufficiently comprehensive and constructive, commenting on strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement.</i>	Yes	Yes, but	No, but	No
Comment:				
Provider Response:				

Section 2: Summary of Findings

Commentary: <i>Please provide any other comments you may have in this section, as well as a summary of your findings from the moderation.</i>	
Recommendations:	1. 2. (etc)
Commendations:	1. 2. (etc)
Optional Considerations:	1. 2. (etc)

Benchmark

- ACAP University College
- Excelsia University College
- Melbourne Institute of Technology
- **Australian Catholic University (ACU)** — Supplementary Assessment Procedure (learning-outcome-targeted design; form of task at the discretion of the Nominated Unit Leader)
- **University of New South Wales (UNSW)** — Supplementary Examinations Procedure (supplementary need not replicate the original assessment in form, provided the same learning outcomes are assessed)

Related Documents

- Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Procedure
- Complaint and Grievance Resolution Policy and Procedure
- Course Design and Development Policy and Procedure
- Course Review Policy and Procedure
- Course Progress and Completion Within the Expected Duration of Study Policy and Procedure
- Student Support Policy and Procedure
- TIIS Glossary of Terms

External Legislation

- Higher Education Standards Framework: Threshold Standards 2021 (Cth) 1.3, 1.4, 2.4, 3.1.2, 5.3.2
- National Code: 6.3, 10

Version History

Policy title	Assessment Policy and Procedure
Current version	1.1 → 1.2 (DRAFT)
Policy Sponsor or Owner	Academic Dean
Endorsed by	Academic Board (pending – submitted for LTC and Academic Board review)
Endorsement Date	Pending – reviewed by LTC 30 July 2026; submitted to Academic Board, August 2026 cycle
Changes in this version	v1.1 – Policy revision integrating review feedback from MC, RF and AW. Key changes: new Section 2A (Generative AI in Assessment); expanded Definitions (GenAI, Authentic Assessment, Reasonable Adjustment); strengthened Policy 2.3, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.19; harmonised Procedure 1.3 with Policy 2.12; enhanced Procedure 4 (verbal summary safeguards); expanded Procedure 5 (special needs timeframes and examples); strengthened Procedure 6 (internal moderation timeframe and feedback loops); updated Procedure 9 (re-mark turnaround and conflict of interest); clarified late penalty wording and late variation governance. All tracked

	changes from MC and TC accepted. v1.2 (DRAFT) – Restructured Supplementary Assessment framework: added new Definition; widened eligibility from 47%–49% to 45%–49% (Policy 6.2.1); required supplementary tasks to be learning-outcome-targeted and benchmarked to the same standard as the original assessment (Policy 6.3.1–6.3.2); confirmed Unit Coordinator/Program Director discretion as to the form of the supplementary task, consistent with ACU and UNSW practice (Policy 6.3.3); added financial-liability and misconduct-investigation eligibility gates (Policy 6.2.3–6.2.4). Consequential edits: realigned RWI mark-range trigger from 47–49% to 45–49% (Procedure 7.1); inserted new Procedure 9.1(g) requiring a single election between resubmission and supplementary assessment where both pathways are available on the same mark band. Strengthened internal moderation of assessment for HESF 2021 (Standard 1.4.3) compliance: added a pre-marking standardisation/calibration requirement (Procedure 6.1); defined an objective moderation sample targeting Fail grades, borderline marks and the Supplementary Assessment band (Procedure 6.2); introduced a variance threshold with escalation to the Program Director and Learning and Teaching Committee (Procedure 6.3); added a five-year moderation record-retention requirement (Procedure 6.4); clarified internal moderator independence (Procedure 6.5); and moved external moderation to a rolling three-year cycle covering all units (Procedure 6.6).
Previous version	Major Changes Rescinded Policies: A02 Assessment Outcome Policy; A13 Student Assessment Policy and Procedure; 02 Exam Protocol and Procedure
Approved by	Board of Directors (pending Academic Board endorsement)
Approval Date	Pending
Date of next review	07 May 2029 (unchanged; to be confirmed on approval of v1.2)

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Details
1.0	Board of Directors	-	
1.1	Board of Directors	07 May 2026	Minor Changes
1.2	Board of Directors (pending Academic Board endorsement)	Pending – LTC 30 Jul 2026	Supplementary Assessment framework restructured (eligibility widened to 45–49%, learning-outcome-targeted design, Unit Coordinator/Program Director discretion as to form); internal moderation strengthened for HESF 2021 (standardisation, objective sampling, variance escalation, record retention, rolling external moderation cycle).

*****END OF POLICY and PROCEDURE*****