

# ASSESSMENT IN COURSEWORK UNITS: GRADING AND MARKING PROCEDURE

## SCOPE

This procedure applies to:

- all coursework units at the former Monash South Africa campus, excluding the thesis component or equivalent of a graduate research course; and
- all teaching periods commencing on or after 3 August 2020. For teaching periods that commenced before 3 August 2020, refer to [version 3.0](#) of these procedures.

## PROCEDURE STATEMENT

These procedures must be read in conjunction with [Monash University \(Academic Board\) Regulations Part 3](#), and [Assessment in Coursework Units Policy](#).

### 1. Grading and marking

- 1.1 The chief examiner must specify a suitable marking guide and/or rubric for each assessment task. The rubrics must describe, for each marking criterion, the level of performance required for the different grades, and must be consistent with the following Monash University Grade Descriptors:

High Distinction (HD) 80-100	Distinction (D) 70-79	Credit (C) 60-69	Pass (P) 50-59	Fail (N) 0-49
Demonstration of extended knowledge, skills and attributes at an exceptional level*, showing fluency, originality and integration of concepts.	Demonstration of extended knowledge, skills and attributes at a superior level*, showing fluency and emerging originality and integration of concepts.	Demonstration of fundamental knowledge, skills and attributes at a proficient level*, showing fluency in concepts.	Demonstration of fundamental knowledge, skills and attributes at a satisfactory level*.	Lack of satisfactory demonstration of fundamental knowledge, skills and expected attributes*.

\* As defined by discipline and faculty standards and exemplars for assessment task type.

- 1.2 The chief examiner must put in place and clearly communicate to staff and students quality assurance mechanisms that will ensure that all assessment items are marked fairly and reliably. To this end, the chief examiner must provide clear instructions to all examiners about the allocation of student marks and grades.
- 1.2.1 When making a recommendation for student results to the board of examiners, the chief examiner must provide a report detailing the following:
- description of equivalence of all unit assessment tasks used across modes and/or locations; and
  - methods used in marking across all locations and/or modes to ensure consistency.
- 1.3 The chief examiner must ensure that the final result for each student is accurately calculated and have appropriate mechanisms in place for verification and recording. The final unit result will be rounded to the nearest whole number (e.g. 79.01 to 79.49 rounds to 79 and 79.50 to 79.99 rounds to 80).
- 1.4 The chief examiner is responsible for ensuring that all assessment items are marked within the faculty timeframe for the return of results to students enrolled in the unit.
- 1.5 Faculties must have processes in place to verify that the results uploaded on the student management system are consistent with the results recorded and held by the chief examiner.

## 2. Marking of examinations

- 2.1 Where the final examination for a unit is written or in digital form, examination answers must be marked blind, as outlined below.

### Blind marking of final written examinations

- 2.2 Final examination responses must not hold any personal information about the student other than the student identification number. Students will be advised to only record their student ID, desk number and unit code in their responses and the examination task set.
- 2.3 For each final examination there must be an attendance list that will contain the following student details:
- student ID;
  - student full name;
  - desk number; and
  - present/absent indicator.
- 2.4 At the conclusion of the examination session, the attendance list is placed inside a sealed bag containing the completed examination response set and returned to the academic or teaching faculty as indicated on the delivery instructions provided by the teaching faculty.
- 2.5 Prior to marking, the attendance list must be removed from the examination responses and stored separately to ensure that it is not available to markers.
- 2.6 Markers must not refer to the attendance list or any other method of identifying a student's name during the marking process.

### Blind marking of final eAssessment examinations

- 2.7 The chief examiner must ensure the student identification facility is disabled in the electronic assessment platform for the duration of the marking process.
- 2.8 Markers must not refer to any student list or any other method of identifying a student's name during the marking process.

### Circumstances in which blind marking does not apply

- 2.9 Blind marking is recommended for multiple-choice examinations, class tests, assignments and for off-campus learning students (where there is no desk number, and the student name is crucial to administrative processes at an external examination venue).
- 2.10 Where the form of a final examination is not written or digital, such as an oral examination, artistic performance or practical demonstration, or laboratory-based examination, blind marking is not required. In these circumstances, other measures must be taken to reduce the risk of bias. Examples include double marking or panel marking, and could involve audio or visual recording of the examination to provide a second marking opportunity.
- 2.11 For units in which oral communication or performance is assessed, and in which this assessment is worth more than 20 per cent of the total mark, quality assurance, verification or double marking of work must be provided through:
- sound and/or video recording; or
  - initial assessment by more than one examiner; or
  - other defensible form of verification agreed by the chief examiner, or the associate dean (education) if the chief examiner is involved in the assessment design.

## 3. Marking and grading of theses for research track coursework degrees

- 3.1 A thesis corresponding to a research project unit worth 12 credit points or more must be assessed by a minimum of two examiners other than the supervisor. The supervisor may be allowed to mark or contribute a mark for non-thesis components worth up to 20 per cent of the overall assessment of the unit. In awarding these marks, the supervisor should be limited to assessing the research process and not the research product (e.g. thesis) itself.
- 3.2 Wherever practical, external examiners (external to the department or school) should be used for theses corresponding to research project units worth 18 credit points or more.
- 3.3 The chief examiner appoints the thesis examiners (including external examiners) in consultation with supervisors, taking into account subject expertise, examining experience and availability. In cases where the chief examiner is a supervisor, the associate dean (research) appoints the thesis examiners.
- 3.4 If there is a difference in the marks awarded by the thesis examiners:
- 3.4.1 Where the difference of marks is less than 10 percentage points, the final mark is calculated as the average of the marks.

- 3.4.2 Where the difference of marks is 10 percentage points or higher, the Chief examiner must determine the final mark by arranging a conference of the examiners to agree on a mark and grade or, failing agreement, appointing an adjudicator who will review the student thesis and examiner reports and recommend a final mark and grade.

## 4. Distribution of grades

- 4.1 The dean or nominee will approve grade distribution guidelines for benchmarking the distribution of marks against relevant faculty data (e.g. course, discipline and unit level benchmarks, etc.), having regard to the size and selectivity of the unit cohort. These guidelines must be sent to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) annually.
- 4.2 Where the distribution of marks within a unit falls outside the faculty guidelines, the chief examiner must provide to the board of examiners, together with the recommended marks, an explanation for the variance.
- 4.3 When a chief examiner determines that scaling of marks is required to ensure equality of outcomes and consistency across different cohorts of students, they must provide to the board of examiners, together with the recommended marks, a detailed justification for the scaling and the method used to adjust the marks.

## 5. Verification of fail grades

- 5.1 The faculty must have specified processes for verifying all fail grades of a unit.
- 5.2 Double marking is recommended for all failed major items of assessment (i.e. where the subsequent marker has access to neither the grades nor the comments of the original marker). Appropriately constituted second marking may also be employed. In cases where it is not possible for an assessment component to be marked at two different times (e.g. performance or oral presentation), two examiners should be present at the execution of the assessment task and agree on a mark to be awarded or a recording of the assessment made to provide a double marking opportunity.
- 5.3 Other defensible forms of verification may be used with the agreement of the associate dean (education) or equivalent. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) will conduct regular audits on the verification of fail grades to ensure marking practices are robust, consistent and fair.

## 6. Amendment of results

- 6.1 Student Education and Business Services (SEBS) must notify faculties each teaching period of the date by which all final results must be uploaded to the student management system.
- 6.2 The faculty general manager or nominee will set internal dates by which all student results recommended by chief examiners will be uploaded to the student management system, so that board of examiners meetings can proceed. After board of examiners meetings, the faculty general manager or nominee must ensure that all final and interim grades recorded in the student management system are correct by the date set for results publication.
- 6.3 If amendments to student results are required after the board of examiners meeting, amendments must be approved by the chair of the board of examiners of the teaching faculty using the Post BOE Result Amendment Form. The form must be retained for audit purposes. When supplementary assessment is granted to a student, the degree faculty must approve the amendment and inform the teaching faculty. Faculties can record an amended result in the student database for a period of up to 19 weeks after the teaching period end date. Faculties that require an amendment to be made after that date must provide a completed Post BOE Result Amendment Form to SEBS for processing.
- 6.4 An audit of all amended results must be performed at least twice per year by each faculty. Post BOE Result Amendment Forms must be checked against amended records extracted from the student management system. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) may conduct additional audits.

## 7. Release of marks

- 7.1 Marks for in-semester tasks and non-examination final assessment tasks will be released to students through the learning management system.
- 7.2 Marks for final examinations will not be released to students.

## 8. Quality verification of assessment across locations and teaching periods

- 8.1 Every two years, chief examiners must conduct benchmarking to verify the comparability of unit assessment standards across the different locations, modes and teaching periods of the unit offering. This should review the work of a small sample of students and be representative of all grade ranges.
- 8.2 Chief examiners must report the findings and any recommendations to the board of examiners. This must be reported annually to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate).

## 9. Re-marking of assessment due to error

### Requests for re-marking

- 9.1 Subject to the fail mark verification procedures, there is no automatic right for students to have a piece of assessment re-marked.
- 9.2 If a student believes that an error has been made in the assessment of their work, they should follow the unit feedback process as set out for the unit.
- 9.3 If after following the unit feedback process, the student is still concerned that their work has been incorrectly assessed, they may follow faculty processes for review of student marks.

### Faculty processes for review of student marks

- 9.4 Faculties must have a specified process for review of student marks where a student complains of error in the assessment of their work. This process must specify:
- the types of assessment to which the process applies;
  - the time limits for applying for a review;
  - the method of application for a review;
  - the grounds for review;
  - the responsibilities for and timing of a response; and
  - how decisions are recorded to alter marks for audit purposes.
- 9.5 In all circumstances, where a student's work is re-marked because of an error, the last mark must stand.

## DEFINITIONS

Blind marking	Process where identifying student information is hidden from the marker while they are marking the assessment task.
Chief examiner	The academic staff member responsible for the implementation of a unit's assessment regime and for recommending the final result for each student. A dean must appoint a chief examiner for each unit taught by the faculty.
Degree faculty	The faculty specified in the Handbook as being responsible for the degree or other award for the year for which the Handbook is published. Double degree courses may have two degree faculties, listed in the Handbook as managing faculty and partner faculty for the course.
Double marking	An independent process completed by a second marker who does not have access to the grades or comments of the original marker. Double markers must have the appropriate level of qualification, discipline knowledge and experience.
Final eAssessment examination	A major assessment task consisting of an invigilated or supervised final examination held after the end of the teaching period delivered in an electronic format. Students must type, indicate or construct responses using software and/or digital devices authorised for use in examinations by the University.
Final examination	An invigilated or supervised examination, held after the end of the teaching period, the results of which are partly used to determine the final result for the unit concerned. A final examination can consist of one major assessment task or can include more than one major assessment task.
Final result	The final mark and/or grade awarded to a student on completion of assessment for a unit.
Interim grade	A grade awarded to a student in a unit when assessment has not been finalised by the time results are published.
Major assessment task	An assessment task that contributes 20 per cent or more to the total assessment in a unit. Minor, regular assessed activities (e.g. weekly quizzes) may be categorised collectively as a major task.
Panel marking	Simultaneous marking of a single performance or body of work by more than one marker, with the final mark

	arrived at either by negotiated consensus among the panel or by averaging the marks of the individual markers.
Second marking	An independent marking completed by a second marker who has access to the grades and comments of the first marker. Second markers must have the appropriate level of qualification, discipline knowledge and experience.
Teaching faculty	The faculty responsible for teaching the unit or, where teaching is shared among faculties, the faculty with the greatest percentage of teaching responsibility.
Teaching period	In relation to a unit of study, the period occupied by the teaching of the unit.
Unit	A component of a course represented by a unit code that is taught as a discrete entity but is not a thesis for a graduate research degree.

## GOVERNANCE

Parent policy	<a href="#">Assessment in Coursework Units Policy</a>
Supporting schedules	
Associated procedures	<p>Assessment in Coursework Units: Development and Implementation of an Assessment Regime Procedures</p> <p>Assessment in Coursework Units: Feedback Procedures</p> <p>Assessment in Coursework Units: Examination Procedures</p> <p>Assessment in Coursework Units: Grading and Marking Procedures</p> <p>Assessment in Coursework Units: Adjustments to Assessment Procedures</p> <p>Assessment in Coursework Units: Security and Record Keeping Procedures</p>
Legislation mandating compliance	<p><a href="#">Monash University (Academic Board) Regulations</a></p> <p><a href="#">Disability Discrimination Act 1992</a></p> <p><a href="#">Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015</a></p>
Category	Academic
Approval	<p>University Education Committee</p> <p>27 January 2021</p> <p>MEETING 1, AGENDA ITEM 11.2</p>
Endorsement	<p>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)</p> <p>11 January 2021</p>
Procedure owner	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
Date effective	17 February 2021
Review date	17 February 2024
Version	1.0
Content enquiries	<a href="mailto:policy-education@monash.edu">policy-education@monash.edu</a>