



Assessment Regime Business Process

SCOPE

This business process applies to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework courses and units offered in the Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences as well as units in which the Faculty has majority teaching responsibility.

PURPOSE STATEMENT

Assessment is an integral component of higher education. Thirty or more years of education-focused research concludes that the design of assessment strategies crucially shapes how students engage with learning. Therefore, our approach to assessment should be a balance between strategies designed to assist learning – assessment **as** and **for** learning, and summative assessment, known as assessment **of** learning.

Assessment strategies should enable academics to diagnose a student's area of weakness and strength and provide opportunities for students to improve in their next assessment task as well as encourage and challenge students to excel in their approach to their studies. This process should also make clear to students how their work was assessed against the expected performance criteria or rubrics.

This business process is aligned with the [Assessment and Academic Integrity Policy](#) (item 1.2) developed to guide the teaching team in creating an assessment regime that:

- is equitable;
- is aligned and integrated;
- is educative and purposeful;
- is challenging and authentic;
- is criterion referenced;
- is quality assured; and
- upholds the standards of academic integrity

1 ASSESSMENT REGIME

The assessment regime of a unit is the set of assessment tasks for the unit. The assessment regime should foster and provide evidence of the achievement of the unit learning outcomes and be part of an integral strategy for assessment at the course level. Whilst the Chief Examiner is responsible for the assessment regime this needs to be undertaken in collaboration with the teaching team. MNHS expects the course convenor, unit coordinators and chief examiners to ensure a collegial process is employed across the course. Particular assistance may need to be given to academics new to Monash University especially in cases where sessional academics are used, and teaching associates are employed to assess student work.

Assessment tasks should be selected to most effectively engage students and set in context of available resources and what is achievable given the circumstances under which the course/unit operates. The assessment regime should consist of a variety of different tasks that may fall into different categories (Table 1). For full reference to Assessments Categories, Definitions and Concepts, ACDC, see [ACDC final document](#).

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT CATEGORIES, ACDC

Animated media	Annotated bibliography	Annotation
Application / request	Article / chapter	Case study analysis and reflection
Concept map	Critical appraisal	Debate
Demonstration	Design / model	Essay
Examination	Oral presentation	Plan
Portfolio	Promotional communication	Reflection
Report	Review	Summary
Thesis	Worksheet / Workbook	

2 UNIVERSITY NOMENCLATURE REGARDING EXAMINATIONS

Currently the university Scheduled Final Assessments Procedure which has replaced the Examinations Procedure, omits any reference to the term category called Examination. Instead what was once referred to as an end of semester examination is now called either a Short-form final assessment or a Long-form final assessment. From the perspective of MHNS, these forms of timed assessment will continue to be categorised as Examinations.

The Faculty specifies that examinations or scheduled final assessments must be at least 50% different in content from previous years to prevent any student with knowledge of the task and/or its solution from a previous offering having an unfair advantage.

3 IMPLEMENTING THE ASSESSMENT REGIME

Since the seminal work of John Biggs¹, there is widespread acknowledgement that if an assessment strategy is to be “effective and meaningful” it must be “aligned” with the teaching methods and instructional approaches used by the teacher. Assessment methods and strategies must demonstrate constructive alignment to the unit’s learning outcomes and learning and teaching activities. The assessment regime of a unit and course should be designed with different learners and their preferences for learning and assessment in mind and provide a variety of assessment options that allow students to demonstrate their learning.

The Faculty Education Committee approved the [proposal for an assessment paradigm shift](#) on 24 August 2020. The proposal outlines perspectives of moving towards an assessment strategy that promotes a continuum of learning and feedback and effective study behaviour. In the context significant disruption to traditional examinations taking place on campus, the need to redesign high-risk assessments and engage students in academic integrity to address contract cheating is critical to inform students of the Australian Government’s amendments to the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (4 September 2020), making it an offence to provide or advertise academic ‘contract cheating’ services in higher education.² The [TEQSA academic integrity toolkit](#) provides further information and resources to assist in the communication with students.

The following sections provide further information on learning outcomes and assessment load, notional hour of effort (NHOE) and weighting of assessment items.

ASSESSMENT AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The Faculty is of the view that 5 to 6 learning outcomes is the appropriate approach for a 6-credit point unit. Similarly, a 12-credit point unit may have of the order of 9 to 10 learning outcomes. For 18- and 24-credit

¹ Biggs, J.B., & Tang, C (2011). Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the student does 4th ed., Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill/Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/monash/detail.action?docID=798265>

² Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) - <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/protecting-academic-integrity>

point units, the number of learning outcomes increase proportionally (ie. 15 to 16 and 20 to 21 respectively). Some key considerations for the alignment of assessment regime with learning outcomes include:

- The assessment design must be at the appropriate AQF level for the unit
- It must be clear what the assessment task is trying to measure and how it is aligned to the unit learning outcomes
- There must be clear evidence that students have had an opportunity to learn and practice the skills and knowledge being assessed ([Assessment Regime Procedure](#))

ASSESSMENT DESIGN

The design of an assessment should be a valid approach for measuring the intended learning outcome, thus the range of assessment modes across a unit (written, practical, oral) should reflect the types of learning being measured (basic knowledge, higher level thinking, practical skills). A capstone unit should be designed to offer students the opportunity to consolidate, evaluate and integrate learning from across a range of learning experiences in the course and engage with a task that addresses current issues particular to a discipline or profession.

All assessment tasks **MUST** be designed to minimise the potential for breaches of academic integrity. The long standing non-invigilated rule remains set at 10%. This rule can apply to any assessment task including discussion boards/forums. It is also possible depending on unforeseen circumstances (e.g. Covid-19) that the weighting will change. Any changes will be communicated separately as approved via Faculty Education Committee.

ASSESSMENT LOAD

Assessment items need to be carefully evaluated for their weighting as both individual components of a unit, and within the overall context of a course. These need to be balanced to avoid competition between assessment tasks. Assessment weightings should reflect the workload expectations in relation to the credit points of the unit (6, 12, 18, 24).

Consideration to assessment load should include:

- For a 6-credit point unit, the number of assessment items should not exceed 4 assessment items. For 12-, 18- and 24-credit point units, the number of assessment items may increase proportionally
- Alternative approaches may include using a sequence of nested tasks as part of a significant assessment task (e.g. annotated bibliography, draft(skeleton) of literature review, final literature review)
- No single assessment item should be worth more than 60% or less than 5% of the total marks available for that unit
- Course teams should ensure that they balance the assessment load horizontally in a semester by developing a timeline blueprint and reviewing or auditing annually

WORKLOAD EXPECTATIONS – NOTIONAL HOURS OF EFFORT

Student assessment workload can be measured by notional hours of effort (NHOE). The use of word equivalence is limited when it comes to assessment items that do not adhere to the 'essay' or other written word format. In order to effectively implement an assessment regime, being guided by NHOE and/or word equivalence is important (Table 2). For AQF level 8 and 9 level courses and in regards to capstone units, an argument may be presented to create assessment tasks that engage at the upper cognitive dimension of Bloom's revised taxonomy³ and therefore may present with higher weighting but lower word equivalences.

³ Anderson, L.W. & Krathwohl, D.R., eds., 2001. [A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives](#). New York: Longman.

As assessment items also include elements of digital media, oral presentation and other creative formats, NHOE should be used for ensuring consistency within a unit or across units in a course and communicating the workload expectations for all assessment items

A word of caution: the NHOE guide should not be over-interpreted. They rarely equate to actual hours but instead should be used as a framework which helps ensure consistency within a unit and provides an indication – to the student and the teacher – of the relative effort that is required.

TABLE 2: NHOE DATA FOR ASSESSMENTS WEIGHTED AT 10% INTERVALS

Assessment Weighting	NHOE (hours) 6 cp unit	NHOE (hours) 12 cp unit	NHOE (hours) 18 cp unit	NHOE (hours) 24 cp unit	“notional word equivalence to a traditional task, an essay, based on weighting @ 6cp)
10%	7.2	14.4	21.6	28.8	600
20%	14.4	28.8	43.2	57.6	1200
30%	21.6	43.2	64.8	86.4	1800
40%	28.8	57.6	86.4	115.2	2400
50%	36	72	108	144	3000
60%	43.2	86.4	129.6	172.8	3600
100%	72	144	216	288	6000

Reference document: [Notional Hours of Effort \(NHOE\)-v4](#)

ASSESSMENT WEIGHTINGS

Assessment weightings have traditionally been equated to word equivalences. This approach must be applied appropriately following consideration of how well the word count reflects workload in order to provide confidence that the weighting does fairly estimate the relative workload between assessments.

This approach has its greatest utility where there is broad agreement on the workload relative to common assessment tasks. Using the tool does not abrogate the need for academics to consider whether this tool is a logical approach and whether the set assessment tasks align with the learning outcomes

As a general guideline, for a 6-credit point unit, the total length of cumulative assessment tasks should not exceed 6,000 words. Each hour of examination is treated as being ‘equivalent to 1,000 words’ of assessment. This word equivalence weighting is also applicable to 12, 18 and 24 credit point units (ie. 12,000, 18,000 and 24,000 words, respectively).

Estimates of workload may also consider prior steps in the assessment process that contribute to the final outcome. For example, a summative assessment task may also consider the nested tasks, for example a draft report, self /or peer assessment or reflection.

The following strategies may be considered ‘equivalent to 1,000 words’ and adoption of these strategies for individual assessment tasks could only be worth up to a maximum of 15% of total marks.

- 1-hour written examination comprising MCQs and/or EMQs
- 1-hour written examination comprising short written responses (SAQ) or scenario-based MCQs at application level / a higher cognitive dimension equivalent to a limit of 1,000 words (eg 4 x up to 250 words each, 10 x up to 100 words each)
- 10-minute individual structured oral presentation, incl. question time and presentation (average 120- 150 word per minute)
- 20 minute/member group structured presentation, incl. question time and presentation
- 10-minute clinical/OSCE station assessment
- Work-based assessments of no more than 30 minutes.
- Simple annotated image infographic or concept map (NHOE ~ 6 hours)
- 2,000-word unstructured reflective journal (including self-assessment exercises)
- 4 Structured laboratory reports of 250 words each
- 4 Clinical procedural reports of 250 words each

USING EXAM-TYPE TASKS (QUIZZES, TESTS, EXAMS) IN UNIT ASSESSMENT REGIMES

A unit's assessment regime may be made up of any type of suitable and pedagogically sound assessment. As per the [University's Assessment Regime Procedure](#), no single assessment may have a weighting of more than 60%.

The *maximum* allowable use of exam-type tasks in an assessment regime within FMNHS is 70%, as outlined below. Due to the limited capacity to provide feedback on individual performance, the use of exam-type tasks should be limited, be thoughtfully implemented, and be used to complement other assessment types.

It is possible to offer students weekly (or regular) quizzes which are not secure but count towards the final mark for the unit, and which can be considered to be a continuous form of assessment. Irrespective of the number of quizzes included in the unit, they can only amount to 10% of the overall marks for the unit.

Within a continuous assessment regime, a series of tests and/or exams can collectively contribute up to a further 60% of in-semester and end-of-semester assessment. These assessments must be appropriately secured (as explained below).

Chief Examiners must also ensure the test/s comply with the MNHS In-Semester Online Examination-Type Assessment Business Process and the Turnitin and Security of Written Assessments Business Process. There may be other complex assessment activities that do not fit into this framework. Please discuss these with the Dean (or their delegate).

SECURING TESTS AND EXAMS

For a test or exam to be deemed secured, you must select a number of security measures listed below which total to at least **100 points**.

Security measure	Points
Invigilation (either face-to-face or via the use of a webcam)	60
Use of a lockdown browser (e.g. Respondus or Safe Exam Browser) without webcam	40
Use of a question bank (recommended: quiz bank size is three times the number of items in an individual's task**).	40
The use of open-ended questions (i.e. not just automated questions such as MCQs)	20
Shuffle question order within section or the whole paper without the use of a question bank	15
Shuffle order of answers for each question (for minimum 50% relevant MCQ questions in the assessment)	15
EITHER A fixed start time (all students begin assessment at the same time)	30
OR The assessment has a limited availability window within which students must commence the task	
<3hr (Within Melbourne business hours)	10
<12hr but more than 3hr	0

See the [MNHS In-Semester Online Examination-Type Assessment Business Process](#) for information about securing your tests and exams.

** e.g. for a quiz where each student is required to answer 30 questions, a suitable quiz bank should contain a total of at least 90 questions (Murdoch & Brenneman, 2020).

ASSESSMENTS USING VIDEO

Producing assessments that are made using digital media can be technically demanding, require the acquisition of a certain skillset in digital literacy and may take considerable effort and should be appropriately weighted. For example, a high quality 5-minute video (including an animation) can take of the order of 10 hours to produce. On the other hand, the video may be the medium of choice for demonstrating mastery or communicating understanding and as such, smartphone or tablet quality products are acceptable. Be that as it may, expectations on the purpose, quality and length of the video and approximate hours of effort need to be clearly communicated to the student. Equally, support for students on how to create and edit videos, software and other tech tools and how to prepare the video for submission as an assessment task should be provided. [The student video guide](#) by Dr L. Heinrich, School of Nursing and Midwifery, provides valuable and useful tips and tools for students.

A 5-minute video that has been created individually should be minimally weighted at 20% or higher if there are other elements leading up to the final video product that are worth including as a nested assessment, for example: the script and/or storyboard. Further consideration must be given to group video production.

ASSESSMENT USING ISAP

Integrating Science And Practice, iSAP, assessments are a case-based assessment type that integrates decision-making with reflective analysis via a 2-submission assessment model. iSAP cases challenge students to evaluate the evidence base and synthesise appropriate information in order to develop a decision response to professional issues arising from the case. Students therefore need to not just consolidate their understanding but also extend their knowledge to an unfamiliar and potentially complex situation. A distinguishing feature of iSAP cases is that students are provided with an expert response (model answers) to the case issues. Students are then tasked with comparing their response to that of the expert and reflect on their learning gains and impact on future practice in the process. The library developed a [learning model on writing the iSAP comparative report](#) and links to this are provided in each case.

Typically, iSAP submissions word weightings are of the order of 2:1 for student response and comparative report respectively. The recommended weighting for written responses to iSAP cases, due to the complexity of the assessment is approximated to 75% of a traditional essay as follows:

- 25%-30%, 1,500-word iSAP, equivalent to a 2,000-word essay
- 35%-40%, 1,850-word iSAP, equivalent to a 2,500-word essay
- 45%-50%, 2,250-word iSAP, equivalent to a 3,000-word essay

We also want to encourage different responses to case scenarios, such as the creation of videos to demonstrate a skill or a flow chart/mind or concept map to illustrate pathways or sequences and in such a case, the NHOE may be a better approximation.

The comparative report instructions have been standardised across iSAP cases and two starting rubrics to consider have been created: [Minimum grading schema](#) and [standard grading schema](#).

For more information on iSAP please visit the [iSAP Home Page](#) Moodle site or contact the [Faculty Educational Designers](#).

4 SCHEDULING ASSESSMENT TASKS

FAIR DISTRIBUTION ACROSS THE SEMESTER

To circumvent concurrently scheduled assessment tasks significantly increasing overall course workload, assessment regimes of same semester units of a course must be arranged with respect to due dates. The [Assessment Timing Tracker](#) can be utilised to minimise assessment overlap.

PEER REVIEWING ASSESSMENT REGIME

The [Assessment Regime Procedure](#) (item 2.7) requires assessment tasks to be scrutinised by another appropriately qualified academic staff member to validate compliance. The purpose of peer review of assessment tasks before scheduling engages academic staff in a continuous quality improvement cycle that ensures validity and improves reliability. Where the assessment is graded by multiple markers, a system of moderation to ensure consistency of measurement and monitor disparities is essential. Consideration to improve reliability should be given to:

- Clear and unambiguous instructions
- Marking criteria or rubrics are well-constructed and agreed with teaching teams
- Questions are clearly phrased and written at the appropriate AQF level
- Time restrictions for completing the task are realistic and achievable

Teaching teams / markers are encouraged to engage in marking standardising workshops that assess the same assessment to compare judgment to reach agreement.

For multiple choice items, Moodle analytics provide information after the scheduling of an assessment based on multiple choice items. The [Instructions for item analysis](#) are a guide to analysing and interpreting those questions that set off particular triggers to see if they are suitable in the current format or need to be revised. The faculty provides guidelines and workshops to create multiple choice questions.

ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS AND ASSESSMENT TASKS

Attendance may be required if directly linked to an assessment task, for example laboratory attendance may be linked to the laboratory report. Similarly, if tutorials require attendance, then these should be followed up with an assessment task.

UNIVERSITY POLICIES/PROCEDURES & FACULTY BUSINESS PROCESSES BY AREA AND TOPIC

Area	Topic	Policy/Procedure	Faculty Business Process
Assessments	Assessment Adjustments		Assessment Regime Business Process
	Hurdles		Hurdle and Additional Assessment Business Process
	Due Dates & Extensions	Assessment Regime Procedure	
	Scheduling of Assessment		Assessment Word Count Business Process
	Supplementary Assessment		
Grades	Grading Schema		
	WAM	Grading Schema Procedure	
	WI eligibility		
Scheduled Final Assessments Procedure	Preparing scheduled final assessment tasks		In-Semester Online Exam-Type Assessment and Turnitin and Security of Written Assessments Business Process
	Final assessment periods		
	Timetable for final assessment periods		
	Student attendance and rules		
	Rescheduling or cancelling final assessments		Calculators in Examinations Business Process
	Security and record keeping		
	Reporting		
Marking and Feedback	Effective feedback		
	Marking feedback		Feedback on end of semester assessment & examinations Business Process
	Feedback timeline		
	Additional feedback	Marking and Feedback Procedure	
	End of semester & exam feedback		Result Finalisation Business Process
	Late penalties		
	Verifying fail grades		
Special Consideration	Eligibility & Supporting Evidence		
	In-semester special consideration		
	End of semester special consideration (non-exam)	Special Consideration Procedure	
	Outcomes of application		
	Deferred exam or final assessment		
Student Academic Integrity	Student responsibilities		
	Breaches of academic integrity	Assessment and Academic Integrity Policy	

	Types of breaches		
	Types of academic misconduct		
	Dealing with suspected breaches		
	Educative response for poor academic practice		
	Dealing with allegations of academic misconduct	Student Academic Integrity Procedure	
	Appeals		
Unit Delivery	Learning Management System (Moodle)	Unit Delivery Procedure	MNHS Blended and Online Learning Hub
	Learning resources		Online Teacher Engagement Business Process
	Lecture recording and live streaming		
	Ethical use of animals		

Date Effective	December 2021
Review Date	December 2024
Process Owner	Office of the Deputy Dean Education
Category	Learning and Teaching
Version Number	4
Content Enquiries	Med-quality-fmnhs@monash.edu
Responsibility for implementation	Chief Examiners Course Coordinators Directors of Education Heads of Department Heads of School
Status	New
Approval Body	Name: Faculty Education Committee Meeting: 5/2021 Date: 29 November 2021 Agenda item: 9.4
Related Policies	Education Policy Bank
Related Documents	