Policy number	P26	Version	10
Approved by ABG on	1 February 2024	Scheduled review date	February 2029

1. Purpose

This policy establishes the National Institute of Organisation Dynamics Australia's (NIODA) approach to the assessment of student work.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all NIODA students completing assessment tasks and all NIODA academic teaching staff.

3. Policy Statement

NIODA is committed to the development of practitioners with high levels of competence and self-knowledge, to social and ethical values, emotional well being, self management and resilience. Assessment of student work is an integral part of NIODA's ethical contribution to the development of professionals, who, through their roles, have an influence on Australian and international organisations.

The following principles are embedded in the NIODA assessment process and procedures:

- what is to be assessed must be congruent with what has been taught

- experiential learning is the basis for conceptual and practical knowing

- learning is continuous and assessment is an integral part of the cycles of learning

- skills acquisition i.e. practical knowing, is equally important as the acquisition of academic and conceptual skills as evidenced in writing

- conceptual understanding of learning is developed in dialogue with other students and staff – in the course and through the assessment process

- staff have final responsibility for all decisions about student assessment. NIODA complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) requirements, and the Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA) Threshold Standards in relation to referencing to other similar courses, about the content, applications, skills and attainment appropriate for each degree course.

4. Forms of Assessment and Grading

Graded assessment in the Master of Leadership and Management (Organisation Dynamics), Graduate Diploma of Leadership and Management (Organisation Dynamics), and the Graduate Certificate of Leadership courses occurs usually through written essays. This type of assessment allows students to integrate learning through the writing process, reinforcing the data driven, reflective nature of enquiry

that is central to systems psychodynamic analysis. It also supports the development of academic writing capacity which is critical to building NIODA's high quality academic culture of scholarship. Alternate assessments are gradually being introduced to the courses to allow for the diversity of ways that students are able to communicate their learning. Alternate assessment grading is at the same rigorous level as applied to grading of written essays. Successful completion of a subject requires a pass grade or higher for all assessable pieces of work.

NIODA's grade evaluation system is as follows:

Grade	Cut-off Parameters
High Distinction	80% -100%
Distinction	70% - 79%
Credit	60% - 69%
Pass	50% - 59%
Fail	Re-submit or fail assessment

5. **Appeals against assessment decisions**

A five stage process is available to students when they have concerns about assessment decisions and/or wish to appeal the decision. It is understood that students may wish to begin the process at any of the five stages.

Stage one - One-to-one meeting with the academic who graded the assignment for the student to raise concerns and for the academic to explain in detail the reason for the grade and to address the student's concerns.

Stage two – One-to-one meeting with the Subject Coordinator (if not the subject academic) for the student to raise any concerns not previously resolved with the academic and for the Subject Coordinator to attempt to address these concerns. The Subject Coordinator meets with the subject academic to hear both sides of the issue before offering a solution. If the assessment was awarded a fail, the Subject Coordinator will have previously marked this paper for moderation purposes.

Stage three – One-to-one meeting with the Master's Course Lead for the student to raise concerns not addressed to their satisfaction in stages one and two. After the meeting with the student, the Master's Course Lead will consult with the Subject academic and the Subject Coordinator to gain a full understanding of the concerns of all parties. The Master's Course Lead addresses the concerns of the student and has authority to request a third marking of the paper from a different teacher and to make a final ruling on the grade.

Stage four - Appeal to be made to the Master's Leadership Team where an Academic Progress subcommittee will be convened.

Stage five - Appeals against Academic Progress subcommittee decisions to be made to the Academic Board of Governance from where a Grievance subcommittee is convened. This is the highest level of appeal process for assessment decisions at NIODA. This process is detailed in the Student Grievance Policy.

NIODA staff are responsible throughout this process for listening respectfully to students' concerns about the assessment and for carefully explaining the rationale for decisions made, with reference to the assessment criteria.

6.   Responsibilities relating to assessment

6.1.   Staff responsibilities

At the commencement of each subject, students are provided with a subject outline that contains details of the assessment tasks, assessment rubric, assessment protocols for the assignment/s, the word limits and the submission date and process.

It is the responsibility of academic staff to allocate time within the subject to discuss and respond to questions related to the assessment task.

Graded assignments are to be returned to students within three weeks from the due date.

Subject Coordinators are responsible for ensuring that assessment tasks coherently link to the subject's content and expected student learning outcomes and that in turn assessment criteria relating to the various gradings coherently link to assessment task requirements. Rubrics are used for the assessment of all assignments. Students are provided with rubrics including criteria and quality descriptions for each criteria. A generic marking guide to the grading differentials is attached as Appendix 1 to this Policy.

6.1.1.   Academic learning support

Subject academics are encouraged to meet with students about any academic issues they may have. Should the student and academic not be able to find ways of resolving the issues then staff members recommend the student make contact with the Student Advisor.

6.1.2.   Moderation

Moderation is undertaken to ensure the assessment that is undertaken is appropriate and consistent across the course of study.

NIODA staff must be acquainted with and ensure that the assessment moderation procedures are adhered to.

Moderation of assessments requires at least one piece of student work from each assessment, individual or group, and all unsatisfactory/fail assignments, be moderated by the Subject Co-ordinator of the co-requisite subject being taught in the same semester. The Subject Co-ordinator can choose to have more than one piece of student work moderated if needed. If there is not a co-requisite subject, the Dean or their delegate, is the moderator. When inconsistencies are found in how assessment decisions are reached and how grading is determined,

discussion must take place between the subject coordinator and the moderator, and if an agreement cannot be reached, with the Dean, who has the delegated authority to determine the final outcome.

When the Dean is an academic in the subject or co-requisite subject, the Master's Leadership Team appoints a third person to mark the paper with the delegated authority to determine the final outcome.

6.2. Student responsibilities

6.2.1. Submission of assignments

A soft copy of the assignment must be submitted to the relevant subject and assessment 'assignment page' via Turnitin by the date specified in the syllabus.

Assignments should have a cover sheet identifying the :

- student's name
- student ID number
- subject academic's name
- subject
- date of submission
- assignment title
- word count

All written assignments should use Calibri 11 point with 1.5 paragraph spacing.

Assignments are expected to be submitted by the due date unless an extension has been approved.

Students must retain a copy of each assignment submitted.

There is no mandatory penalty for exceeding the word count but students should be made aware that when allocating marks the marker does not include any work after the maximum word limit has been reached. Students may therefore be penalised for a failure to be concise and for failing to conclude their work within the word limit specified. Likewise, a failure to meet the maximum word limit may result in lower marks based on the quality of the work because the necessary level of analysis required for the assessment has not been included to meet the stated learning outcomes.

Students who are experiencing difficulty with the submission of assignments either in regard to assignment content or submission dates are responsible for speaking to the academic staff as early as possible to enable appropriate support to be put in place.

6.2.2. Plagiarism, contract cheating, and use of generative AI

Plagiarism and contract cheating are not acceptable within NIODA. The use of other people's work or ideas must be acknowledged and correctly referenced. Similarly it is unacceptable to employ or use a third party to undertake assessed work. Plagiarism or contract cheating may result in charges

of course misconduct, which carry a range of penalties, including cancellation of results and exclusion from the course. Students are responsible for ensuring that their work is kept in a secure place. It is also a disciplinary offence for students to allow their work to be plagiarised by another student. See Academic Misconduct Policy. NIODA uses plagiarism detection services to aid students and staff in the detection of plagiarism, prior to final submission by the student and in the marking processes.

Generative AI is not to be used to write or rewrite student or candidate work. Students and candidates may choose to use the generative AI to undertake exploratory and early thinking work. If such AI generated text or ideas are used in assessments they must be appropriately referenced. The amount of text used should be the same as any other quote. The use of generative AI without referencing is considered plagiarism. Further detail on the use of generative AI can be found in NIODA's *Artificial Intelligence - Students and Candidates Policy*.

6.2.3. Extensions

Requests for an extension of the assignment submission date of no more than two weeks must be addressed in writing to the subject academic staff member prior to the submission date. The request must state the reason for the requested extension. Extensions are only granted in circumstances of significant events including, but not limited to, illness or sudden crisis or increased load at work or home.

The subject academic staff member is responsible for acknowledging receipt of a student request for an extension and notifying the student that an extension has or has not been granted.

Requests for extensions of longer than two weeks beyond the submission date should be addressed to the Student Service Lead, who is acting on behalf of the Master's Course Lead.

The Student Service Lead then requests the student to complete a Special Consideration form. On receipt of the application the Master's Course Lead convenes a meeting of the Special Consideration subcommittee of the Master's Leadership Team where a decision is made on the veracity of the student's application for extension of a submission date or for alternate assessment in accord with the Special Consideration Policy.

Special consideration may take the form of an extension of time for submission of assignments or an alternative assessment method.

Further details and special consideration application forms are available in the Special Consideration Policy available on the NIODA website https://www.nioda.org.au/policies.

6.2.4. Resubmission

Where an assessment piece is graded a fail after moderation procedures occur, students have one opportunity to resubmit the piece. Resubmissions can only be graded as pass (50%) or fail. Where a student elects to not resubmit an assessment piece or where the resubmission is graded a fail after moderation procedures occur, the student will have one opportunity to repeat the whole subject in a subsequent semester.

7.   Unsatisfactory academic progress

When it is clear that students are at risk of failing a subject or subjects either for the first or second time, staff have a responsibility to ensure that students are informed of student advisory facilities at NIODA and that the Master's Course Lead is aware the student is at risk.

Students who fail a subject for the second time are excluded from further re-enrolments in the course.

In this instance students can appeal against exclusion from the course through application to the Master's Leadership Team. The Master's Leadership Team will convene an Academic Progress subcommittee where the student has the opportunity to present their case. The student must provide documented evidence (e.g. medical evidence) that shows subject failure was outside of their control.

Where evidence is accepted, the Academic Progress subcommittee must be convinced that the student is likely to succeed in a third attempt at a subject. To enable this, the committee must consider what support NIODA can offer the student.

8.   Grievances

Grievances relating to student assessment and academic progress subcommittee decisions should be taken up as per the NIODA Candidate and Student Grievance Policy. This policy is published on the NIODA website https://www.nioda.org.au/policies.

9.   Publication

This policy is publicly available on the NIODA website https://www.nioda.org.au/policies.

10.   Related Documents

Special Consideration Policy

Candidate and Student Grievance Policy

Academic Misconduct Policy

LM(OD) Progression and Exclusion Policy

Artificial Intelligence Policy

APPENDIX 1

MARKING GUIDELINES

Introduction

A Pass grade would be received when the student has satisfactorily completed all required elements of the assessment requirements. A Credit grade would be received when the quality of the work is beyond this, and a Distinction grade would be received when the submission is 'Distinctive'. To gain a High Distinction grade would be unusual in the first year of the course as it is likely students will take time to gain full understanding of system psychodynamic concepts and their application.

High Distinction (HD) 80 – 100%

Exceptionally clear understanding of subject matter and appreciation of issues; well organised, formulated and sustained arguments that are grounded in data, including the student's own experience as potential system data; well thought out and structured diagrams; extensive and in-depth use of relevant literature; systems psychodynamic concepts are defined and used, showing sophisticated understanding; well written, structured and referenced. Evidence of creative insight and originality in terms of comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

Distinction (DI) 70 – 79%

Strong grasp of subject matter and appreciation of key issues, clearly developed arguments that are grounded in data, including the student's own experience as potential system data; relevant and well-structured diagrams; appreciation and in-depth use of relevant literature; well written, structured and referenced. Systems psychodynamic concepts are defined and used, showing in depth understanding Evidence of creative and solid work in terms of comprehension, application, analysis and synthesis.

Credit (CR) 60 – 69%

Competent understanding of subject matter and appreciation of the main issues; clearly developed arguments with strong links to data, including the student's own experience as potential system data; relevant diagrams and literature use; well written, structured and referenced. Systems psychodynamic concepts are defined and used, showing clear understanding. Solid evidence of comprehension and application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

Pass (PA) 50 – 59%

An appreciation of subject matter and issues; arguments that make sense and are grounded in data but generally lacking in depth and breadth and with some gaps. Analysis is grounded in data, including the student's own experience as potential system data, and utilises some relevant theory. Systems psychodynamic concepts are defined and used, showing understanding. Usually investment of greater care and thought in editing, organising and structuring work and in referencing would be required to improve.

Fail (NN) 0 – 49%

Evidence of lack of understanding of subject (minimal or inadequate comprehension and little or no application) and an inability to identify issues. Often inadequate in depth and breadth. Poor definitions., inadequate referencing. Sometimes incomplete or irrelevant.