Alphacrucis University College

Assessment Policy

Effective Date: 2026.03.31
Last Reviewed: 2026.01.31
Version: v3 2026.09.14

1. Purpose

This policy outlines Alphacrucis University College (AC) subject or unit assessment principles and processes.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all students enrolled in, and all staff involved in the delivery of coursework subjects in both Higher Education (HE) and Vocational Education and Training (VET).

3. Definitions

3.1. **Lecturer:** refers to the faculty member primarily responsible for the delivery and / or grading of the subject or unit.

3.2. **Assessment Word Count:** a requirement of the assessment task that places the responsibility on a student to demonstrate their achievement of a subject or unit learning outcome within this parameter

4. Policy Statement

AC's assessment practices will adhere to the tenets specified herein.

4.1. Principles of Assessment

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

a. assessment will safeguard academic standards and the integrity of awards through adherence to internal policy and ethical standards, including the AC Code of Conduct and Student Workload Calculator;
b. assessment design, including professional accreditation requirements, will be monitored and reviewed according to internal quality assurance systems and processes, for the purpose of continuous improvement;
c. assessment is criterion-referenced and aligned to learning outcomes and graduate attributes;
d. assessment facilitates valid, reliable, and fair measurement and reporting of the level of student achievement of learning outcomes and graduate attributes;
e. work-integrated-learning, such as practical placements, are assessed according to the stated learning outcomes aligned to this activity;
f. 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;
g. when assessment requires students to consult physical and online texts, including generative artificial intelligence tools, appropriate referencing of these resources is required, as usually reflected in the rubric for a task;
h. reasonable adjustments will be provided where appropriate;
i. 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 subject;

j. a minimum of two and a maximum of four assessment tasks per subject or unit, will usually apply;
k. mapping of assessment due dates across the semester will be undertaken to ensure management of student workload;
l. 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;
m. assessment and grading processes will be transparent as far as practicably possible;
n. group work will usually be worth no more than 30% of the total assessment in a subject, unless specific learning outcomes for the subject require collaborative learning. If learning outcomes require group assessment, then no more than 50% is permissible;
o. consideration will usually be given to the proportion of assessment conducted under controlled conditions (e.g., exam) to safeguard integrity of assessment;
p. 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;
q. VET students usually need to achieve 'satisfactory' in all assessment tasks to be competent in each unit;
r. HE students must submit all assessment tasks to be eligible to pass a subject or unit, on the basis that this is a requirement to demonstrate satisfactory achievement of subject or unit learning outcomes;
s. 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;
t. A student has no automatic right to a re-mark, resubmission, or supplementary assessment task.

4.2. Submission of Assessment Tasks

4.2.1. Subject and 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. 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.

4.2.2. Students in all VET units are usually allowed three attempts at each assessment task. The first attempt is to be submitted by the assessment due date. The second and third attempt must be submitted within one week from the date on which the student received feedback on their first and/or subsequent attempt. An incorrect assessment submission will be counted as an assessment attempt.

4.2.3. For VET in School students, the maximum amount of permitted re-submissions will usually be three, but may be adjusted in accordance with the State Education Department's policies for VET courses run as a part of their state education.

4.3. Extension of Assessment Task Due Date

4.3.1. 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 psychologist):
a. medical illness;
b. extreme hardship;
c. compassionate grounds;
d. faculty supervised project amendment.

4.3.2. Although the term, 'compassionate grounds' allows some flexibility, such circumstances would usually involve significant disruptive circumstances.

4.4. Unavoidable disruption

4.4.1. 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:

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

4.5. Late Assessment Submission

4.5.1. HE Students

4.5.1.1. Students are expected to submit assessments by the due date. Students who do not submit assessments on the due date without an extension or unavoidable disruption are at risk of receiving a penalty for that assessment, usually 5% of the value of the task, per calendar day late. After 14 days, a '0' (zero) will be recorded for that task.

4.5.1.2. Variations of this policy may be appropriate for particular subjects or units, and where applicable, this will be communicated to students, usually via the subject outline.

4.5.2. VET Students

4.5.2.1. Students are expected to submit their first assessment attempt by the due date, unless they have an extension approved or other unavoidable disruption circumstances. Students who do not submit their assessment by the due date, must submit their assessment by the due date of their second assessment attempt (see Submission of Assessment Tasks above) or they will receive a Not Yet Satisfactory for that assessment (unless they have an extension approved or other unavoidable disruption circumstances).

4.6. Review and/or Re-marking of Assessments

4.6.1. Students have the right to request an explanation of grades awarded for work completed during the semester. Initially, students should discuss any concerns with their lecturer who will consider their request, liaise with the marker (where applicable) and provide a response. If the student is still dissatisfied and feels there are grounds for requesting that an assessment task be re-marked or a supplementary assessment task be completed in the event of a Fail or Not Yet Satisfactory grade, the student should initially informally discuss the matter with the Subject Coordinator. The Subject Coordinator may arrange for a further grading opinion from an experienced faculty member, or conduct or oversee a re-marking of the assessment task. If the matter is still not satisfactorily resolved at this time, the student should write to the Program Director (or equivalent) requesting a re-mark or supplementary assessment task within ten days of the Subject Coordinator's response. The Program Director may determine that the student has no grounds for a review.

4.6.2. If a supplementary assessment task is approved, the relevant Subject Coordinator is to decide the date, time and type of assessment which is to take place and notify the student, in writing, of these arrangements. Where a resubmitted assessment for a failed assessment task is allowed, the student is eligible to earn a maximum of a pass grade (of 50%) or a "Satisfactory" grade.

4.6.3. Lecturers may also, with Subject Coordinator approval, offer a student who has done the work but failed an assessment the opportunity to resubmit an improved version, or a new assessment, for a maximum pass grade (of 50%), or for VET, a "Satisfactory" grade.
4.6.4. In the event of a re-marking request by a student, the re-marked result will be the officially recorded result for that assessment item, thus, the appeal may result in a lower mark or grade being awarded for the assessment task.
4.6.5. Any further appeals of an assessment grade should be directed to the AC Complaints and Grievance Resolution processes.

4.7. Invigilation for HE students

4.7.1. In the case that a student needs to complete an exam remotely (i.e., not at an AC location), the student must arrange for a suitable location and an appropriate invigilator (e.g., pastor, professional; not a family member or friend) to oversee the exam and ensure academic integrity. This requirement will similarly apply to online students for any exam. The exception to the need for an invigilator may be for "open-book" exams, or similar.
4.7.2. Remote exam conditions should reflect on-campus exam conditions as far as possible. Students may also be required to submit a declaration that the work is entirely their own, and they did not engage in academic misconduct during the exam.
4.7.3. Students must arrange for their invigilator or exam supervisor to complete the AC Exam Supervision Form and submit this form on Moodle prior to sitting the exam. The form is available on the AC website.
4.7.4. There are valid circumstances where online invigilated exams are an appropriate method of assessment. In such circumstances, TEQSA guidelines with regard to effective online invigilation strategies will be followed as far as reasonably practicable.

4.8. Postgraduate coursework research projects

4.8.1. Postgraduate coursework research projects completed by AC students will be examined by appropriately qualified experts. The research project examination process is an integral part of ensuring the academic quality, originality and integrity of AC courses, and promotes dissemination of the research.
4.8.2. Research students, supervisors and examiners must adhere to the Grading Policy.

4.9. Re-enrolment in a subject or unit

4.9.1. HE students who fail to achieve 50% overall in a subject, receiving a permanent 'Fail' on their transcript, and who then wish to pass the subject, must re-enrol and resubmit all forms of assessment required by the lecturer. Provided the subject has not significantly changed, and if the 'Fail' grade was not the result of poor attendance, then with the lecturer's approval the student will not be required to attend classes. Furthermore, with the prior approval of the lecturer, a student may resubmit assessment work previously submitted in that subject, where appropriate with the necessary improvements to enable them to achieve a passing grade.
4.9.2. A HE student will not be permitted to repeat a subject more than once unless under exceptional circumstances, and then with the permission of the relevant Program Director (or equivalent);
4.9.3. VET students who are 'not yet competent' at the end of the unit assessment period will be required to retake the unit at another time. There is no limit to the number of resits.

---

5. Procedures

Assessment Procedures

5.1. Applications for Extensions

5.1.1. HE and VET students are to submit the online "Request for Extension Form".

5.1.2. The request should be submitted before the assignment is due, with supporting documentation. Lecturers are permitted to grant extensions up to two weeks past the due date on the above grounds in this Policy. Program Directors (or equivalent) are permitted to grant long extensions.

5.1.3. Any extension request beyond four weeks due to a student's circumstances is to be reviewed by the Program Director, in consultation with the Head of School if required. A long extension request must be formally made by the student via email. In assessing the request, due consideration will be given to the circumstances of the student as well as the end date of the relevant teaching period, in relation to the impact of a long extension on enrolment. If approved, the Program Director will notify the student and relevant Lecturer of the arrangement. Requests that extend beyond the census date of the following teaching period require approval by the Student Affairs Committee. The student will receive an 'In Progress' grade in the meantime and incur no financial penalty in this case. Further, once the assessment has been submitted and assessed, the 'In Progress' grade will be replaced by the new grade.

5.1.4. A request for an extension does not guarantee approval. The decision is at the discretion of the Lecturer, Program Director, or Head of School. Normal appeals processes can be accessed.

5.2. Unavoidable Disruption

5.2.1. Where a student requests an extended deadline due to an unavoidable disruption, the student should report the circumstances that prevented them applying for extension and/or submitting the assessment, to the Program Director. The Program Director will review the request and notify the student and relevant Lecturer of the decision, including if approved, new arrangements for assessment.

5.2.2. If approved, the student will receive an 'In Progress' grade in the meantime and incur no financial penalty. Further, once the assessment has been submitted and assessed, the 'In Progress' grade will be replaced by the new grade.

5.2.3. The decision is at the discretion of Program Director. Normal appeals processes can be accessed.

5.3. Variation of Assessment

5.3.1. Students are encouraged to inform AC of any disability, medical condition or learning need that may impact on their studies prior to census date. This is so a variation of assessment can be arranged, or, in case it is not possible to arrange, a change of enrolment may be advised and facilitated.

5.3.2. To request a variation of assessment due to disability, medical condition or learning needs:

a. A meeting is to be arranged by the student with their Program Director (or equivalent) and a Student Experience Team representative to discuss alternative assessment arrangements. Students must provide at or prior to the meeting appropriate documentation (medical certificate, social worker and/or psychologist letter), to support an alternative assessment recommendation. Discussion is to centre on the student's needs, propose reasonable and equivalent assessments, as well as maintain the academic equity and fairness of the course. Advice and support on alternative assessments can be requested from the Chair of Learning and Teaching Committee as necessary.

b. If an alternative assessment method is proposed, a study plan is to be tabled at the relevant SAC by the Program Director (or equivalent) with supporting documentation for approval. If approved, this is to be communicated to all relevant stakeholders. If denied, the student can follow AC's Complaint and Grievance Procedures.

5.4. Proposal for coursework research project

5.4.1. After consultation with the Program Director (or equivalent) and/or potential supervisor, a research student should submit a completed Research Proposal Form to the Program Director (or equivalent) prior to the commencement of the research. This includes any required ethics approval documentation if relevant. The research project should not commence until the Program Director (or equivalent) has approved the proposal. Where necessary, the Program Director (or equivalent) will approach and appoint potential supervisors on the student's behalf.

5.5. Appointment of examiner for coursework research project

5.5.1. Some postgraduate courses require the completion of an externally marked research project. Such projects will be marked by one qualified external academic whose area of expertise is aligned with the topic of the project. An examiner should:

a. hold a degree of a level at least equivalent to the one of the project being marked, or preferably, AQF +1 Level to the student's course;
b. have research and/or professional expertise appropriate to the student's research topic.

5.5.2. The student and supervisor should agree to up to three potential examiners, noting any that may have a potential conflict of interest or other reason why the appointment of a marker may be inappropriate. The supervisor then provides the names of up to three suggested examiners to the Program Director (or equivalent). The external examiner will then be appointed by the Program Director (or equivalent).

5.5.3. Once the research is examined, the examiner sends the result to the Program Director (or equivalent) who informs the supervisor and, in turn, the student. The examiner and the student are not to make direct contact until after the examination report has been received. Any grievance must adhere to the Complaint and Grievance Resolution Policy.

5.6. Assessment Word Count

5.6.1. If a written assessment is more than 10% under the stated word count, it is likely the requirements of the assessment will not have been met, which will affect the grade. If the assessment exceeds the word count by more than 10%, the marker may stop grading the assessment at that point; if the argument has not been sufficiently made, or requirements such as a conclusion etc. met, the grade is likely to be affected. Footnotes are usually not included in the word count. It remains at the discretion of the marker to determine the extent to which the submission meets the requirements and expectations of the assessment, and to apply reasonable grading and penalties accordingly.

5.7. VET Assessments

5.7.1. VET assessment tools/tasks are to be reviewed prior to use using AC's VET Assessment Pre-Use Validation Form. The review outcomes are to guide updates to assessment tools before implementation. As per AC's Validation Policy.

5.7.2. VET assessment judgments are to be made by qualified assessors as per AC's Trainer and Assessor Policy.

5.7.3. VET assessments must follow the principles of assessment:

a. Fairness means: (a) individual student needs are considered, (b) reasonable adjustments are made where appropriate, (c) students are informed of the assessment process, (d) reassessment opportunity is provided where judgement is 'not yet competent'.
b. Flexibility means: assessment is appropriate to context and determined on individual basis.
c. Validity means: assessment requires practical application of competencies.
d. Reliability means: evidence is interpreted consistently

5.7.4. VET assessors are to make individual assessment judgements based on the rules of evidence (validity, sufficiency, authenticity, and currency) to assess a VET student's competency.

a. Validity means: the assessor is assured that the student has skills, knowledge and attributes described in the training product.
b. Sufficiency means: the quality, quantity and relevance of evidence enables accurate judgement of competency.
c. Authenticity means: the assessor is assured the evidence is genuine work of the student.
d. Currency means: the assessor is assured the evidence demonstrates current skills and knowledge.

5.7.5. VET assessors are to provide clear, constructive feedback to the student on the outcome of the assessment task, as well as advise on gaps, reassessment, and appeals process, as relevant.
5.7.6. Validation of assessments to occur as per AC's Validation Policy
5.7.7. VET assessment evidence is to be retained for two years from the date of competency judgement, with secure backup systems

6. Responsible for Implementation

Learning and Teaching Committee

7. Related AC Policies or Documents, Standards and Legislations

7.1. AC Policies or Documents

This policy is to be read in conjunction with the following AC policies available at https://ww1.ac.edu.au/ppm/

7.1.1. Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy;
7.1.2. Higher Education Course Design and Development Policy;
7.1.3. Higher Education Course Review Policy;
7.1.4. Course Progression Policy;
7.1.5. Grading Policy;
7.1.6. Higher Education Monitoring and Moderation of Grades Policy;
7.1.7. Higher Education Student Workload Policy;
7.1.8. Higher Education Subject Development, Delivery and Review Policy;
7.1.9. International Student Policy;
7.1.10. Micro-credentials and Short Courses Policy;
7.1.11. Student Complaint, Grievance Resolution, and Appeals Policy;
7.1.12. Support for Students Policy;
7.1.13. Validation Policy;
7.1.14. Work Integrated Learning Policy;
7.1.15. Exam Supervision Form;
7.1.16. Request for Extension Form;
7.1.17. VET Assessment Review Checklist: Prior to Use.

7.2. Relevant Standards and Legislations

7.2.1. The Australian Qualifications Framework | AQF;
7.2.2. Higher Education Standards Framework 2021;
7.2.3. Outcome Standards for Registered Training Organisations 2025;
7.2.4. National Vocational Education and Training Regulator (Compliance Standards for NVR Registered Training Organisations and Fit and Proper Person Requirements) Instrument 2025: Division 2 Standard 11;
7.2.5. Credential Policy (Standards for Registered Training Organisations);
7.2.6. Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS Act);
7.2.7. The National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (National Code 2018).

8. Review and Revision

This policy will be reviewed by the Learning and Teaching Committee on a regular basis in accordance with the Policy Development and Review Policy. Any proposed changes will be tabled at the approving committee for consideration. Revisions will be communicated to all relevant stakeholders once approved.

9. History of Approval and Amendments

Policy owner	Chair, Learning and Teaching Committee
Policy category	Academic: Learning and Teaching
Policy status	Approved
Approval Body	Academic Board
Endorsement Body	Learning & Teaching Committee
Approval Date	2026.03.31
Last Review Date	2026.01.31
History of Policy Amendments	
V1 2023.11.10	Motion: AB2023-10-M05: Mapped to Higher Education Standards Framework, RTO Standards, National Code; Added AQF as a related document; Removed reference to HESAC/VETSAC and replaced with Student Affairs Committee; Procedures regarding long extensions updated.
V2 2026.01.31	Motion: AB2026-03-M01: Update to VET assessment requirements; To align with the new Standards for RTOs 2025 (Compliance Requirements 9–12)
V2.1 2026.07.15	New template
V3 2026.09.14	Revisions to Assessment Word Count (definition added, 5.6 revised)

Add a new row for each version of the policy. Do not remove previous changes.