

# The Mind Lab Assessment, Feedback and Moderation Policy and Procedures

Purpose	2
Scope	2
Policy Statement	2
Responsibilities	3
Assessment, Moderation and Feedback Procedures	4
Special Assessment Circumstances:	5
Exceptional Special Assessment Circumstances:	5
Assessment Outcomes:	6
Pass with Requirements	7
Administrative grades	8
Resubmissions for Level 8 Assessment Items:	9
Assessment of Level 9 Assessment Items:	9
Assessment and Moderation Panels	9
Resubmission of Level 9 assessment items (under Assessment and Moderation Panel process)	11
Level 9 Project Report Embargo Guidelines	12
Assessment Turnaround and Feedback:	12
Feedback Procedures	12
Release of assessment outcomes	12
Moderation	12
Moderation Procedures	12
Appendices	15

## Purpose

This policy provides the benchmark for robust assessment and moderation practice at The Mind Lab. It supports the premise of assessment as an integral part of learning activity; the

importance of timely feedback in the learning process; and the importance of fairness and consistency through engaged moderation practices.

## Scope

This policy applies to all on-site, off-site and flexible learning and teaching assessment events and practices in The Mind Lab<sup>1</sup> courses and programmes. It must be read in conjunction with any specific programme assessment details described in individual programme regulations. Assessment practice is inclusive of both formative and summative assessment, serving both developmental (educational) and judgement (measurement) functions.

This policy also provides a framework for internal and external moderation practices which enable moderation to verify that assessment design and assessor judgements are valid, fair, consistent and reliable; meet approved learning outcomes; and are appropriate to the learning environment.

*Note: Not every procedure included in this policy is relevant to every assessment situation. Minor adjustments where needed may be approved by the National Academic Director. Any major departures must be approved by the Mind Lab Academic Board. Questions regarding interpretation of and variation to the procedures set out in this policy are directed in the first instance to the National Academic Director. The provisions relating to assessments must be read in conjunction with the programme-specific regulations.*

## Policy Statement

All courses and programmes at The Mind Lab will employ appropriate assessment, moderation and feedback practices that enhance the quality of student learning, evaluate competency and achievement, and promote the development of capability and meet all external regulatory requirements.

The Mind Lab assessment, moderation and feedback practices will be guided by the following principles:

1. Assessment required for the completion of a course can take the form of examinations, tests, assignments or other forms approved during the programme approval or improvement process, and may be carried out by individual students or a group of students.
2. No changes to assessment schedules may be made during a course unless approved through the programme improvement process and notified in writing to all students enrolled in the course. In these situations, students shall be consulted about any changes prior to the programme improvement approval.
3. Every programme where assessment contributes to credits must include appropriate procedures for moderation.
4. Assessment and moderation will be authentic, learner-centered, fair, valid and consistent, and utilise transparent processes
5. Assessments will reflect a standards-based approach and assess agreed learning outcomes appropriately in direct relation to the level of the course.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tech Futures Lab is a wholly owned subsidiary of The Mind Lab. All policies and procedures of The Mind Lab also apply to Tech Futures Lab. Terms and Conditions, Policies and Declarations that relate to The Mind Lab also relate to Tech Futures Lab unless expressly stated otherwise.

6. Assessment and feedback practices will provide opportunities for learners and teachers to engage as responsible partners in the learning process.
7. Assessment may take many forms and use a variety of methods to provide equitable opportunities for every student to engage with learning processes and provide evidence of their learning, without any unnecessary barriers to progression.
8. Assessment events and methods will be:
  - a. valid (measure what they set out to measure and be consistent with the stated learning outcomes and level);
  - b. reliable (provide consistent results, regardless of the assessor, the assessment venue or timing of the assessment); and
  - c. practicable (can be carried out effectively, taking the required time and other resources into consideration).
9. The purpose of assessment will be made explicit to learners at all times.
10. Accurate and timely information regarding assessment and assessment conditions will be communicated to learners at the beginning of their study, usually within the first two weeks of the start of a course or programme.
11. Students have the right to submit assessments in te reo Māori or New Zealand Sign Language.
12. Students whose assessments have been affected by circumstances not in their control, will have the opportunity to apply for consideration under Special Assessment Circumstances procedures.
13. Assessment outcomes will be as stipulated in programme specific regulations, using the processes stated within The Mind Lab Academic Management Policy and Procedures.
14. All Assessment Outcomes will be verified and ratified by appropriate academic processes.
15. Student achievement (including assessment outcomes) will be tracked by The Mind Lab to ensure appropriate and timely student support.
16. Assessment Outcomes and assessment materials will be kept according to external regulatory rules.

## Responsibilities

1. The Policy Owner is responsible for ensuring that this policy is kept up to date and meets the needs of learners and all relevant legislative and regulatory requirements.
2. The National Academic Director is responsible for ensuring that staff are resourced and supported to provide students with a range of innovative and appropriate assessment practices.
3. Programme Leads are responsible for ensuring students are provided with equitable access to resources which support learning and achievement.
4. Academic Board is responsible for monitoring and evaluating assessment and feedback practices as required in this policy and other requirements outlined in other policies and programme documents.
5. Academic Board and Academic Quality Working Group are accountable for implementing this policy paying particular attention to the following:
  - a. Coherence between course content and outcomes, and the development of student capability through assessment processes.
  - b. Ensuring students have a strong understanding of assessment practices.

- c. Developing assessment processes and criteria that promote student engagement and enhance their learning.
  - d. Developing internal and external processes to ensure assessments are fair, valid and consistent.
  - e. Designing assessments which reflect a balance between current course-content and long-term learning capabilities.
  - f. Ensuring there are opportunities for students to be assessed in te reo Māori and New Zealand Sign Language.
  - g. Providing opportunities for student engagement in peer- and self-assessment.
  - h. Ensuring a shared understanding between staff and students of assessment requirements and criteria.
  - i. Providing opportunities (where appropriate) for student negotiation of the form and content of assessment;
  - j. Ensuring students understand the type and nature of the evidence they may provide;
  - k. Ensuring that all students are treated fairly in group-based assessments;
  - l. Ensuring transparency and equity in marking student work against assessment criteria.
  - m. Ensuring that the programme of assessment is equitable and considerate of student well-being.
  - n. Ensuring that assessments are distributed appropriately across courses so that:
    - i. Staff and student workload is appropriate and manageable and
    - ii. The health and wellbeing of staff and students is protected and supported
  - o. Ensuring the confidentiality and security of assessment results.
  - p. Maintaining professional standards throughout assessment, moderation and feedback processes.
6. Academic Staff are responsible for taking the steps necessary to understand the principles and practices of assessment in this policy, and for ensuring that assessment, feedback and moderation requirements are met.

## **Assessment, Moderation and Feedback Procedures**

**Assessment Setup:** The following activities are completed before commencement of courses (*Accountability:* Programme Lead). See also the *Assessment Setup Process*

- a. The validity, level and appropriateness of assessment items are robustly checked and reviewed through pre-moderation. See Moderation section below. See also Assessment and Moderation Panel section if relevant.
- b. Assessment details (as follows) are communicated clearly and through appropriate means to students e.g. student handbooks, student-facing assessment descriptors, the Learning Management System (Student Portal) and academic calendars. Student-facing Assessment Descriptors contain all pertinent information about assessment items including, where appropriate, the following (see also Student-facing Assessment Descriptors guideline and template);
  - i. Assessment submission expectations (including dates)
  - ii. A description of the assessment task aligned to the relevant learning outcomes (see guidelines).
  - iii. Assessment weightings

- iv. Rubrics
- v. The assessment grading system (see below) and requirements to pass
- vi. Assessment turnaround policy (see below)
- vii. Assessment outcomes
- viii. What to expect and how to use assessment feedback
- ix. Implications and options following release of assessment outcomes
- x. Special Assessment Circumstances (see section below)
- xi. Te Reo Māori and New Zealand Sign Language submission options (see section below)

***Special Assessment Circumstances:***

1. Special Assessment Circumstances (SAC) relate to student performance in compulsory assessments being affected by factors beyond the control of the student.
  - a. "Affected" means influenced in some way. For examinations, tests, and assessments, this may include the inability to attend any or all of the Assessment events, or diminished performance. For all other assessment items, it may be the inability to meet deadlines or diminished performance within deadlines.
  - b. "Factors beyond student control" means any circumstance or event which the student could not foresee or reasonably have prevented, including, but not limited to sickness, injury or bereavement.
2. Students must apply for Special Assessment Circumstances no later than 7 days after the assessment deadline.
3. Applications should normally be supported with evidence (for example, a medical certificate or other documentation), unless otherwise discussed with the Programme Lead.
4. SAC outcomes can include the following;
  - a. An aegrotat estimation of the grade based on other same-course assessment outcomes that map to relevant learning outcomes.
  - b. An assessment extension of no longer than 6 weeks.
  - c. An alternative option designed by the programme lead to ensure relevant learning outcomes are assessed.
5. The SAC/ESAC procedure for approval and tracking of SAC applications and outcomes is the responsibility of the National Academic Registrar and Programme Leads.

***Exceptional Special Assessment Circumstances:***

1. In exceptional circumstances, students can apply for *Exceptional Special Assessment Circumstances* (E-SAC). E-SAC applications are for:
  - a. Rare occasions when it would be unreasonable and insensitive to ask students to complete a SAC form; or when the situation was such that SAC submission deadlines have been missed as a result of the exceptional circumstances.
2. Students must contact the Programme Lead directly to discuss the circumstances, normally no later than 7 days after the assessment due date. Programme Leads can complete the form on behalf of the student and provide documentation as evidence.

**Assessment Outcomes:**

Assessment Outcomes including grades are awarded using one of the assessment systems stated below, as specified in the programme specific regulations and Course Descriptors. The final outcome including grades for each course will be recorded once students have completed all summative assessments.

- 1. Achievement-Based Assessment (4 point):** In a course where a 4 point Achievement-Based Assessment is used, the following grades can be given:

A	80 - 100	Credits earned
B	65-79	Credits earned
C	50-64	Credits earned
D	0-49	No credits earned

- 2. Achievement-Based Assessment (11 point):** In a course where a 11 point Achievement-Based Assessment is used, the following grades can be given:

A +	90-100	Credits earned
A	85-89	Credits earned
A-	80-84	Credits earned
B +	75-79	Credits earned
B	70-74	Credits earned
B-	65-70	Credits earned
C +	60-64	Credits earned

C	55-59	Credits earned
C-	50-54	Credits earned
D	40-49	No credits earned
E	0-39	No credits earned

### 3. Competency-Based Assessment

Candidates must demonstrate competency for all Learning Outcomes. Course assessment outcomes are determined in the following manner:

- a. A pass is an achievement of competency in all Learning Outcomes of the course. The learning objectives are considered separately but they are interconnected.
- b. Pass with requirements awarded when the majority of Learning Outcomes are met, but some more work is required from the student for a Pass grade to be awarded (see more information below).
- c. Not competent awarded when assessments do not meet any of the Learning Outcomes to the level expected. Full resubmission required.

In a course where Competency Based Assessment is used, the following assessment outcomes can be given:

P	Pass	Credits earned
DE F	Pass with Requirements*	Credits not yet earned
NC	Not Competent	No Credits earned

#### **\*Pass with Requirements**

Programmes and courses that have a pass with requirements option should normally follow the procedure outlined below unless otherwise stated in specific programme regulations.

- a. Usually an assessment item that has a Pass With Requirements option is assessed using a Competency-Based Assessment process (to obtain a Pass grade an assessment item must meet all assessment criteria in order to evidence competence).
- b. When an Assessment and Moderation Panel considers an assessment item to have met most but not all criteria, minor or major requirements can be set by the Panel. These requirements would need to be met by a date determined by the Panel and to the satisfaction of an authority (such as the Programme Lead or the Panel

- convenor) as determined and clearly communicated by the Panel. The timeframe for completing requirements should not normally be more than 2 weeks.
- c. The student will receive a DEF (deferred) administrative grade until the requirements are or are not met.
  - d. Once requirements have been submitted by the student, and a Pass grade approved by the delegated authority, communication must be sent to the student to inform them of the Pass grade being awarded. This communication should be filed in the Digital Filing Cabinet (see Academic Records Management, in Academic Management Policy).
  - e. If requirements submitted still do not allow the assessment to Pass, a Not Competent grade must be given. Students must be informed of this result, and offered the opportunity to apply for a full resubmission of the assessment (see below for details on resubmissions).

### **Administrative grades**

The following administrative grades will be used and may be awarded to students in circumstances identified below; where any grades lead to the accumulation of credits toward a qualification, the administrative grade listed identifies whether credits are "earned" or "not earned".

Code	Grade	Explanation
DNC	Did Not Complete	Assessment Level: recorded if students do not submit an assessment. Course Level: recorded if students have either withdrawn after 75% of the scheduled Course duration; or not attempted a compulsory item of Assessment within a Course. No Credits earned. Programme level: recorded if students withdraw from a programme after 75% of the programme duration has been completed, irrespective of grades attained at course level. Credits earned depending on courses completed by the student.
DEF	Deferred	Assessment Level: recorded if students have an SAC/ESAC, or receives a Pass with Requirements grade.
W	Withdrawal	Course Level: recorded if students withdraw from a Course after 10% of the scheduled Course duration and up to, or at, the date at which 75% of the scheduled Course has passed. No Credits earned. Programme level: recorded if students withdraw from a programme after the last date for withdrawal with a refund but before 75% of the programme is completed.
NGA	No Grade Associated	Course Level: No Grade Associated: Course Assessment and reporting of results is carried out by an external agency. No Credits earned.

SUS	Suspended	Course Level: recorded when students suspend their enrolment. Level 9 courses only.
SCR	Specific Credit Recognition	Course Level: Specified credits earned through Cross Credit from another Qualification and/or through the Assessment of Prior Learning
NCR	Non Specific Credit Recognition	Course Level: Non-specified credits earned through Cross Credit from another Qualification and/or through the Assessment of Prior Learning
RP	Restricted Pass	The relevant Academic Authority may award a 'restricted pass' in a course which was narrowly failed and where there is ample evidence that marginal failure is compensated by good overall performance. The student has been awarded a restricted pass subject to Academic Board Approved. Credits earned.

**Resubmissions for Level 8 Assessment Items:**

1. Students who have failed an assessment item can apply to the Programme Lead for a resubmission opportunity within 7 days of receiving their assessment feedback. .
2. Unless otherwise specified in programme regulations, students can normally apply for a resubmission of one assessment item for each course.
3. Under normal circumstances, students can apply for a resubmission of one assessment item in each course, subject to a maximum of 4 resubmissions during their enrolment in a programme
4. The timeframe for submitting a resubmission after a Not Competent or less than 50% grade is normally between 2 - 4 weeks. The specific timeframe for each application will be determined by the Programme Lead.
5. The Academic Quality Working Group delegates authority for approval of resubmissions to the Programme Lead. All resubmission applications and approval conditions must be noted and discussed at The Mind Lab Academic Quality Working Group.
6. Resubmission outcomes can be:
  - a. Competency Based Assessment: Competent/Not Competent
  - b. Achievement Based Assessment: No more than 50% grade can be achieved

**Assessment of Level 9 Assessment Items:**

**Assessment and Moderation Panels**

1. All Level 9 research projects are assessed by an Assessment and Moderation Panel.
  - a. The assessors are asked not to conduct a critique, but to establish for themselves the standard of the work as aligned to the candidate's agreed-on stated outcomes and criteria.
  - b. The presentation may be recorded on video as an archival record of the project.
  - c. The presentation can be a public event (unless otherwise requested) and therefore an audience will be in attendance and may contain important project stakeholders.

2. The Assessment and Moderation Panel are made up of internal and external examiners, Supervisors, and Programme Lead or delegated authority as Convenor. Supervisors are members as advocates of their students. Each Panel must have at least one external member.  
*Note: External examiners need to complete Conflict of Interest [form](#).*
3. Assessment and Moderation Panel membership must be approved by the National Academic Director before assessments are submitted. Academic Quality Working Group to be notified of Panel membership.
4. All level 9 Research reports of less than 90 credits must be examined by at least two examiners. Both examiners can be internal, but should not have been involved with the student's work previously.
5. All level 9 Research reports of 90 credits or more must be examined by at least two examiners:
  - a. One of these examiners may be an internal staff member of The Mind Lab not familiar with the student work under consideration.
  - b. One examiner will be an independent external examiner who is not a member of the academic staff of The Mind Lab, and who has not acted previously as the candidate's supervisor.
6. Supervision cannot be examiners of their own students' summative assessments for level 9 courses.
7. The Assessment and Moderation Panel shall, at the time of the presentation of work, determine and recommend a grade to the Assessment Convenor. The panel may recommend that a project be:
  - a. Accepted and a pass grade awarded.
  - b. Accepted and a pass grade awarded after requirements have been met to the satisfaction of the Assessment Convenor;
  - c. Rejected in its present form and awarded a Fail/Not Competent grade, but be permitted to apply for a resubmission to be assessed by at least one of the original examiners, including at least one external examiner (if the candidate is enrolled in a level 9 course of at least 90 credits). Other courses can be re-assessed with an internal examiner.
  - d. Failed with no right of resubmission, and awarded a Fail/Not Competent grade.
8. The Assessment Convenor shall provide a written report to the Academic Quality Working Group, detailing the examiners' recommendations including any required amendments at the earliest possible date after the assessment has been held. In the event that the Assessment Panel recommend accepting the project after requirements have been met, or rejecting it in its present form but permitting re-submission, the Convenor's report shall:
  - a. Detail any amendments which the candidate is required to make to the project and the timeframe for completion of these requirements.
  - b. Detail the shortcomings in the project which make it unacceptable in its present form, along with an indication of which of the examiners will re-assess the re-submitted work.
  - c. If assessors do not agree about the final grade, and at least one of them thinks that the work does not merit a passing grade, the Assessment Convenor will conclude that further adjudication of the work is necessary.
  - d. In cases when adjudication is necessary, the Assessment Convenor will request for approval by the National Academic Director the appointment of an

independent adjudicator. The adjudicator will be normally be external to The Mind Lab and will be provided with both the student's research work and a copy of the Assessment Convenor's report and the grade recommendations. The adjudicator's decision is final. The adjudicator will be an expert in the relevant field with expertise related to the specific project. Any and all correspondence with the candidate regarding the outcome of an adjudicated assessment process shall be conducted by the Academic Board or delegated authority.

### **Resubmission of Level 9 assessment items (under Assessment and Moderation Panel process)**

1. If a candidate receives a *Not Competent* grade for an assessment, they have the option to apply to the Assessment and Moderation Panel for an opportunity to resubmit. They must apply in writing within 7 days of receiving the fail grade. A due date for the re-submission will be determined if the Assessment and Moderation Panel deems the candidate worthy of an opportunity to resubmit.  
*Note: If circumstances for the fail grade are exceptional, the SAC process should be followed, not the resubmission process.*
2. A resubmission application can be applied to:
  - a. Initial submission of the assessment
  - b. Failure to complete the requirements for an assessment
3. Unless otherwise stated in the programme *regulations*, students can normally only apply for one re-submission per course. An application must be made, and will be approved by the Assessment and Moderation Panel Convenor. The following criteria should be used as the basis for determining eligibility to resubmit:
  - a. Unanimous agreement by members of the Assessment and Moderation panel that the candidate is committed and likely to succeed on the remainder of programme.
  - b. The candidate must have completed all other requirements of the course (including any compulsory formative assessments ).
  - c. The candidate must agree to sign a document, with the Programme Lead, committing to reaching all future milestones of the programme.
4. Resubmission Outcomes:
  - a. For achievement based assessment, a resubmitted assessment cannot be awarded more than 50%.
  - b. For competency based assessment, a resubmitted assessment can only be awarded a Pass or Not Competent grade. Pass with requirements cannot be awarded.

### **Level 9 Project Report Embargo Guidelines**

1. Unless students are otherwise informed, all Level 9 research reports and artefacts submitted by students are automatically embargoed. If students do not want their work to be embargoed, they must contact [academicmanagement@themindlab.com](mailto:academicmanagement@themindlab.com).
2. All final reports and artefacts will be filed in a secure Research Management System. All non-embargoed reports will be made publicly available through The Mind Lab E-Press.

### **Assessment Turnaround and Feedback:**

1. Feedback for both formative and summative assessed work (including grades where relevant) will be provided to learners within a specified timeframe, normally no later than 3 weeks after the due date of the assessment.
2. Timely feedback on student work is to be provided with the intention of enhancing learning and achievement. Feedback should be aligned to learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Feedback timeframes should be explained to students, and documented feedback provided.
3. Feedback must be well documented for moderation purposes and recorded accurately against students records.

### **Feedback Procedures**

#### ***Release of assessment outcomes***

1. Assessment outcomes and feedback for formative and summative assessments will be released to students in The Mind Lab Learning Management System not later than 3 weeks after submission.
2. Formative assessment outcomes do not contribute to the calculation of the final grade.

#### ***Moderation***

1. Robust internal and external moderation processes will be implemented for all programmes, to ensure fairness and consistency across markers.
2. Moderation is built into assessment processes through Assessment and Moderation Panels for all summative assessments.

#### ***Moderation Procedures***

1. All moderations processes meet or exceed external regulatory body requirements (e.g. NZQA).
2. All programmes must have moderation plans submitted by the Programme Lead to the AQ Working Group for approval before the commencement of a cohort. All moderation plans must ensure the following;
  - a. Pre-assessment moderation ensures the validity of assessment tools and activities
  - b. Post-assessment moderation ensures assessment decisions are accurate and consistent. This includes moderation and benchmarking of assessments submitted in te reo Māori or New Zealand Sign language.
  - c. Minimum moderation requirements Level 8 and Level 9 (60 credits or below): All assessment items are internally moderated every second intake and externally every third intake.
  - d. Minimum moderation requirements Level 9 (over 60 credits): All assessment items are externally moderated.
  - e. All assessment items are moderated internally and externally in the first intake of any newly approved programme.
  - f. Moderation plans include actions from prior external moderation reports.

- g. Moderation plans include how moderation is documented and reported to AQ Working Group.
- 3. Evidence of moderation for the year prior must be submitted to the AQ Working Group annually each February at the latest.
- 4. The following moderation requirements apply at an assessment, course and programme level for each programme intake.

	Internal	External
Assessment Moderation Requirements	Double marking and/or moderation by Programme Lead or representative and/or assessment by Assessment and Moderation Panel	Level 8 and Level 9 (60 credits or below): Moderation of all summative assessment. Level 9 (over 60 credits): External Assessment and Moderation of all summative assessment moderated together with other related summative assessments (e.g. Project Plan/Scope)
Course Moderation Requirements		External moderator to overlook a sample of marked assessments and A&M panel reports.
Programme Moderation Requirements		External Monitors (NZQA and other regulatory professional and government bodies)

**Assessment Tracking:**

Assessment submissions are tracked by TML staff. Appropriate action is taken (including student communication) when students fail to submit assessment items by set deadlines. See Assessment Tracking Process.

**Ratification of Final Course Outcomes and Grades**

Assessment outcomes are verified and signed off by the programme lead and ratified with the National Academic Registrar. See Assessment Outcome Ratification Process.

**Academic Record Management:**

Assessment outcomes, course and qualification completion are managed according to Academic Records Management Policy and Procedures outlined in the Academic Management Policy, in compliance with external regulation.

<b>Definitions</b>	
Consistent	means that, given similar circumstances, the assessor would make the same judgement again and the judgement will be similar to judgements that other assessors would make
Fair	means that assessment methods will not disadvantage individuals or groups by hindering or limiting them in ways unrelated to the evidence sought
Feedback	means information or comment (including grades where appropriate) about students' performance of the assessment task, which is the basis for affirmation, learning or improvement
Valid	means that assessment will be fit for purpose, so that assessment focuses on the requirements specified in the learning outcomes
A work-based or work-relevant research project	A work-based or work-relevant research project is a project based-in and/or relevant to the candidate's area of interest, discipline or practice. This is identified and defined by the master's candidate.
Embargoed	Project reports that are embargoed are not publically available, but stored securely at The Mind Lab to comply with <a href="#">NZQA PTE Enrolment and Academic Records Rules 2012</a> .
Formative Assessments	These assessments do not contribute marks towards students overall course grade. The purpose of formative assessments is to provide regular feedback to students to enable them to improve their learning and make progress. Formative assessments can also alert staff to where students might be having difficulties and implement strategies to help mitigate risk of failure in summative assessments.
Summative Assessments	These assessments are formally marked and contribute toward students overall course grade. Summative assessments measure students' performance or level of achievement toward achieving the learning outcomes of a course.
Supervisor	Academic Staff member at The Mind Lab who meet the eligibility criteria for supervision of Level 9 Research. Also can be referred to as 'Advisor'.

### **Relevant Policies**

Specific Programme Regulations

TML Academic Management Policy and Procedures *Section: Academic Records Management Policy and Procedures*

[TML Student Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedures](#)

Assessment Outcome Ratification Process

Assessment Tracking Process

Assessment Setup Process

## **Appendices**

Recommended Assessment Convenor Report Template