



Charles Sturt
University

SUBJECT OUTLINE

Assessment Reviewer Guide (CDAP)

Division of Learning and Teaching

Version 1.1 2026
Charles Sturt University

Charles Sturt University - TEQSA Provider Identification: PRV12018 (Australian University). CRICOS Provider: 00005F.

Contents

Reviewing Assessment Quality in CDAP	5
Guide for School Assessment Reviewers	5
Understanding the review standard	6
Policy and procedure requirements	6
Quality review standards	6
CDAP and operational requirements	8
What does publication ready mean?	8
Understanding student-facing and system fields	8
Reviewer responsibilities and boundaries	9
What reviewers can change	9
What reviewers must not change	9
Reviewer operating principle	10
Reviewer workflow	11
1. Open the correct Proposed version	11
2. Review the assessment program as a whole	11
3. Review each assessment item	11
4. Correct minor typographical errors only	12
5. Leave comments for required changes	12
6. Check the revisions	12
7. Complete the final whole-of-assessment check	12
8. Mark the review complete	12
Review Process	13
1. Review the assessment program as a whole	13
2. Essential Requirements to Pass the Subject	14
3. Number	14
4. Task Title	15
5. Value and Weighting Type	15
6. Duration / Length	15
7. Due Date	16
8. Due Supplementary Information	17
9. Assessment Type	17

10. Method of Assessment	18
11. Submission Method.....	18
12. Individual or Group	18
13. Individual Component	19
14. 7 day auto extend.....	19
15. Supervised Assessment	19
16. Hurdle Task.....	20
17. Hurdle Task Description.....	21
18. Centrally Timetabled	21
19. Examination information	21
20. Generative AI	22
21. Task Description	22
22. Rationale	24
23. Subject Learning Outcomes.....	24
24. Rubric.....	25
25. Feedback Method	27
26. Applies to All Offerings.....	27
27. Adding or removing assessment tasks	28
28. Indicative Sum of Assessments	29
Using CDAP functionality	30
Comments during review	30
Using Track Changes.....	31
Using Field Audit History.....	31
Final whole-of-assessment check	33
Compliant	33
Quality assured	33
Operationally correct	34
Review completion	34
Completing the assessment review.....	35
Reviewer role: at a glance.....	36
Quick reviewer checklist.....	37
Whole assessment.....	37
Policy and procedure requirements	37
Student-facing information	37
CDAP and operational checks	38
Review comments	38

DRAFT

Reviewing Assessment Quality in CDAP

Guide for School Assessment Reviewers

This guide supports staff undertaking the **School quality review of assessment information in CDAP** before the Proposed academic item is finalised and returned to an Approved state.

The purpose of the review is **not to redesign the assessment or undertake a new curriculum approval process**. Reviewers are checking that the Proposed assessment is:

- compliant with relevant policy and procedure requirements;
- academically sound and coherent;
- clear and usable for students;
- aligned with the Subject Learning Outcomes;
- appropriately designed for the students and their stage of learning;
- correctly configured in CDAP; and
- ready for publication in the Subject Outline.



The [Assessment Policy](#) establishes requirements for assessment design, learning-outcome alignment, academic integrity, student diversity, feedback and quality assurance.



It also recognises the University's Assessment Design Principles as part of the Charles Sturt Curriculum Model.

The substantive assessment quality review occurs in **CDAP**. The later Subject Outline QA process should confirm that the Approved assessment information has transferred and is displaying correctly, rather than repeating the full assessment review.

Related help:

[Subject Outline: CDAP to Subject Outline Tool support website](#)

[Updating Assessment Information: How CDAP and the Subject Outline Tool Work Together](#)

Understanding the review standard

The review brings together **three different types of checks**.

Type of check	What it means	Reviewer approach
Policy / procedure requirement	A requirement established by a Charles Sturt policy or procedure.	The assessment must comply before the review can be completed.
Quality review standard	An educational quality expectation used to determine whether the assessment is clear, coherent, appropriate and ready for students.	Apply professional judgement. If the standard is not met, leave a comment explaining what should be improved.
CDAP / operational requirement	A requirement of CDAP, the CDAP-to-SOT process, or an institutional implementation requirement.	The information or configuration must be correct before the assessment is publication ready.

Policy and procedure requirements

Where this guide states that a policy or procedure **requires** something, it is a compliance requirement.

For example:

- hurdle assessments must meet the requirements of the [Assessment Policy](#);
- group assessment is subject to the [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#);
- required assessment information must be communicated to students in accordance with the [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#); and
- automatic extensions operate under the [Assessment Flexibility Procedure](#).



A reviewer should not mark the review complete while a mandatory requirement remains unmet.

Quality review standards

Quality review standards support professional judgement about whether the assessment is sufficiently clear, coherent and educationally sound to be published.



Many of these standards are informed by the [Charles Sturt Assessment Design Principles](#).

The Principles provide guidance at both course and subject level and are aligned with the HESF and Charles Sturt policy requirements.

They include assessment that:

- ✓ facilitates learning success;
- ✓ is purposeful, rigorous and intellectually challenging;
- ✓ aligns to outcomes;
- ✓ is valid and reliable;
- ✓ is authentic and connected to professional knowledge and practice;
- ✓ supports academic integrity;
- ✓ is informed by quality assurance;
- ✓ is clear and explicit;
- ✓ is inclusive and equitable;
- ✓ is manageable and sequenced; and
- ✓ elicits constructive feedback.

CDAP and operational requirements

Some requirements arise from the CDAP-to-SOT implementation rather than directly from policy.

Examples include:

- Task Description and Rubric fields having a maximum of 10,000 characters;
- tables, images and embedded datasets not being supported in those fields;
- **Examination** being used as the CDAP Assessment Type only for centrally timetabled assessments;
- the supervised-assessment implementation requiring an assessment to be Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory or weighted at 30% or more; and is
- where **Generative AI = Yes**, permitted use needing to be explained in the Task Description.

These requirements still need to be resolved before the assessment is publication ready, but they should not be described as policy requirements unless a relevant policy or procedure requirement is also identified.

What does publication ready mean?

Before adding **Assessment Review Complete**, the reviewer should be satisfied that the assessment is:

- **Compliant** — mandatory policy and procedure requirements are met.
- **Quality assured** — the assessment is clear, coherent and educationally appropriate.
- **Operationally correct** — CDAP information and settings are configured correctly.

Understanding student-facing and system fields

Not every CDAP field is displayed directly to students.

- **Student-facing:** The information is used in the assessment information students see in the Subject Outline.
- **Not directly student-facing:** The field supports CDAP, reporting, governance or another institutional process. The field itself is not displayed directly to students.

This does not mean the underlying requirement can be omitted from student-facing information where students need to know it.

- **System / process – student-facing consequence:** The field itself may not display directly, but its selection affects what students see or requires related information to be communicated elsewhere.

For example:

- **Hurdle Task Description** is not student-facing, but hurdle requirements must be communicated to students.
- **Generative AI** is a system selection, but permitted use must be explained in the Task Description where Yes is selected.
- **No Feedback Provided** affects whether a return date appears in the Subject Outline.

Reviewer responsibilities and boundaries

The reviewer quality assures the assessment and identifies changes required before it is ready for publication.

What reviewers can change

Reviewers may directly correct **minor typographical errors**, such as obvious spelling or punctuation errors, where the correction does not alter meaning or intent.

What reviewers must not change

Other than minor typographical corrections, reviewers **must not directly edit assessment content**.

This includes changes to:

- assessment instructions or requirements;
- task titles;
- weighting;
- due dates;
- assessment types or settings;
- SLO selections;
- rationale;
- rubric criteria or performance standards;
- hurdle requirements;
- generative AI requirements;
- offering applicability; or
- assessment structure.



Where a change is required, **leave a Comment for the Subject Coordinator** explaining what needs to be addressed.

The Subject Coordinator remains responsible for making the change.

Reviewer operating principle

Minor Typo

Reviewer may correct it

Anything else requiring change

Leave a comment

Assessment publication ready

Add “Assessment Review Complete” comment

Related help:

[Using Comments, Track Changes and Field Audit History in CDAP](#)

DRAFT

Reviewer workflow

1. Open the correct Proposed version

Confirm that you are reviewing the **Proposed academic item for the correct year**.

For example: **202690 Subject Outline** → **2026 Proposed version in CDAP**

Where useful:

- select the previous Approved version under **Compare version**; and
- use **Track Changes** to see what has changed.

The screenshot shows the CDAP interface for 'EHR101 Sociocultural Foundations of Sport and Exercise : Overview'. The 'Compare version' dropdown is set to '2026.01' (APPROVED). The 'Track Changes' button is highlighted with a red circle. The 'Assessment Items' table is visible, showing details for the '2026.02 PROPOSED' version.

Assessment Item	Due Date
Due Date	24 Mar 2026
Due Supplementary Information	
Assessment Type *	Written Other
Method of Assessment	Reflective
Submission Method	Brightspace Assignment
Individual or Group	Individual
Individual Component	
7 day auto extend *	No Yes
Supervised * Assessment	No
Hurdle Task	No
Hurdle Task Description	

Related help:

[Finding the Correct Subject Version and Editing Assessment in CDAP](#)

[Using Comments, Track Changes and Field Audit History in CDAP](#)

2. Review the assessment program as a whole

Consider the overall structure, SLO coverage, weighting, sequencing, workload, due dates and any group, hurdle, supervised, examination or offering-specific arrangements.

3. Review each assessment item

Work through the fields using the detailed guidance below.

4. Correct minor typographical errors only

For any other change, leave the content unchanged and use a Comment.

5. Leave comments for required changes

Clearly explain what the Subject Coordinator needs to address.

6. Check the revisions

Confirm that each issue has been resolved. Use Track Changes or Field Audit History where helpful.

7. Complete the final whole-of-assessment check

Confirm that the assessment is compliant, quality assured, operationally correct and publication ready.

8. Mark the review complete

Add the exact comment at the top of the academic item:



Assessment Review Complete

Review Process

1. Review the assessment program as a whole

Review type: Quality review standard informed by policy and the Assessment Design Principles

Before checking individual fields, consider the assessment across the subject.

Check:

- ✓ Do the tasks collectively provide credible evidence of the relevant SLOs?
- ✓ Is the assessment appropriate for students' stage of learning?
- ✓ Is it sequenced so students can progressively develop and demonstrate capability?
- ✓ Are the number, type, weighting and demands of tasks appropriate?
- ✓ Are assessment workload and due dates reasonably distributed?
- ✓ Does the design appropriately consider diverse learners?
- ✓ Does it provide equitable opportunities for students to demonstrate learning?
- ✓ Does the design appropriately manage academic-integrity risk?
- ✓ Are opportunities to receive and use feedback evident?
- ✓ Are group, hurdle, supervised and examination arrangements appropriate?
- ✓ Where offerings have different assessment versions, does the overall program remain coherent?



The [Assessment Policy](#) and [Course and Subject Procedure – Coursework Design](#) establishes broader requirements relating to alignment, diversity, workload, academic integrity and feedback.



Reviewer tip

Quality lens: Relevant [Assessment Design Principles](#) include:

- Principle 1 – Assessment is designed to facilitate learning success
- Principle 3 – Assessment is aligned to the outcomes
- Principle 6 – Assessment is designed to ensure academic integrity
- Principle 9 – Assessment is inclusive and equitable

- Principle 10 – Assessment is manageable and sequenced
- Principle 11 – Assessment is designed to elicit constructive feedback.

Early assessment

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement where applicable

The [Course and Subject Procedure – Coursework Design](#) requires courses to include one or more appropriate subjects with an early low-weighted assessment task. Where this subject fulfils that course-level requirement, check that it continues to do so.

2. Essential Requirements to Pass the Subject

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement

Check that the field:

- ✓ clearly states what students must do to pass the subject;
- ✓ is consistent with the assessment tasks listed;
- ✓ accurately reflects hurdle requirements;
- ✓ does not refer to an assessment that has been removed or renumbered; and
- ✓ is clear to students.



The [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#) requires the Subject Outline to contain the information students need about requirements for passing the subject.

Where a hurdle is involved, also check compliance with the [Assessment Policy](#).

3. Number

Student-facing

Review type: Quality review standard / CDAP operational requirement

Check that:

- ✓ numbering is correct and internally consistent;
- ✓ equivalent offering-specific versions use the intended assessment number; and
- ✓ references to assessment numbers elsewhere remain correct.

4. Task Title

Student-facing

Review type: Quality review standard

Check that:

- the title is clear and concise;
- students can readily identify the assessment; and
- terminology is consistent with the Task Description.

5. Value and Weighting Type

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and CDAP operational requirement

Check that:

- the percentage is correct;
- the task is correctly configured as **Weighting %** or **Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory**;
- weighting is coherent across the assessment program; and
- the tasks applicable to each offering total correctly.



The [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#) establishes requirements for assessment marking arrangements.

6. Duration / Length

Student-facing

Review type: Quality review standard informed by policy

Check that:

- number and unit are consistent;
- expected scope is clear;
- supplementary information is used where required; and
- the expected workload is reasonable relative to the weighting and complexity of the task.



The [Assessment Policy](#) links assessment design to appropriate student engagement and learning.

Whether the particular task length is proportionate to its weighting and complexity remains a **quality review judgement**, rather than a fixed formula.



Reviewer tip

Quality lens: [Assessment Design Principle 10 – Assessment is manageable and sequenced](#). The Principle emphasises manageable assessment that efficiently assesses achievement and is appropriately sequenced across the teaching period.

7. Due Date

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement where applicable, plus quality review standard

Check that:

- ✓ the date is correct for the offering;
- ✓ it is appropriately positioned within the subject;
- ✓ students have reasonable time to prepare; and
- ✓ it is consistent with other assessment information.



Where the subject has a final exam: The [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#) restricts specified assessment in the final teaching week where a subject has a final exam.



Reviewer tip

Quality lens: [Assessment Design Principle 10 – Assessment is manageable and sequenced](#) supports assessment that is logically sequenced, dispersed appropriately and gives students adequate opportunity to succeed.

8. Due Supplementary Information

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and CDAP operational requirement

For variable due dates, check that:

- ✓ the fixed Due Date field is blank;
- ✓ Due Supplementary Information explains when or how the task becomes due; and
- ✓ the arrangement is also clear in the Task Description.



The requirement to provide students with assessment timing information is supported by the [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#).

Using the supplementary field while leaving the fixed date blank is a **CDAP operational requirement** for variable dates.

Related help:

[Due Dates, Exams, Feedback and Special Assessment Settings](#)

9. Assessment Type

Not directly student-facing

Review type: CDAP operational requirement

Check that the selected type accurately classifies the task.

EXAMINATION

For the CDAP-to-SOT process: **Only centrally timetabled assessments should be classified as Examination in CDAP.**

Therefore: **Assessment Type = Examination → Centrally Timetabled = Yes**

This is a **CDAP operational requirement**, not a general University definition that every exam-like assessment must be centrally timetabled.

Other assessment types are available to cover tests and invigilated tests, that happen outside of the Examination window.



The wider [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#) also provides for other exam and test arrangements.

10. Method of Assessment

Not directly student-facing

Review type: CDAP classification check

Where used, check that the selected method reasonably describes the nature of the assessment.

This field is optional.

11. Submission Method

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and CDAP operational requirement

Check that the selection accurately reflects how students submit or undertake the task.

'Other' can be used as the submission method where the options in the list do not match the submission requirements. Additional information can then be entered to explain the submission method.



The [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#) establishes requirements for submission through the specified University system, online tool or other approved method.

12. Individual or Group

System / process – student-facing consequence

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement

Check that Individual or Group is correctly selected.

Where Group is selected, also review the Subject Learning Outcomes to ensure they require students to demonstrate collaboration or team work. Individual Component and Task Description.

Check that relevant student-facing information explains:

- ✓ how the task will be assessed;
- ✓ how individual and group marks operate;
- ✓ how groups are formed;
- ✓ support available;
- ✓ how group issues are resolved; and
- ✓ how the group determines that work is ready for submission.



The [Assessment Policy](#) establishes the circumstances for appropriate use of group assessment.

The [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#) sets the detailed requirements, including limits on the contribution of group work to the subject mark and information that must be provided to students.

13. Individual Component

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement where applicable, plus quality review standard

Where an individual component exists, check that it is clearly described and consistent with the Task Description and Rubric.

14. 7 day auto extend

Not directly student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and CDAP operational requirement

Check that Yes/No correctly reflects whether the automatic extension can apply.



The [Assessment Flexibility Procedure](#) establishes automatic-extension arrangements and applicable exceptions.

The CDAP setting should be consistent with those requirements.

15. Supervised Assessment

Not directly student-facing

Review type: CDAP / institutional operational requirement

Check that Yes/No reflects the assessment design.

A supervised assessment involves real-time interaction between the student and assessor and/or direct observation of student performance during a controlled assessment process.

Examples include:

- live viva or oral assessment;
- directly observed practical performance;
- simulation;
- live online demonstration; or
- directly observed workplace performance.

For the University's supervised-assessment implementation, a supervised assessment must also be:

- **Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory; or**
- **weighted 30% or more.**



Supervised Assessment

These are institutional implementation requirements:

<https://www.csu.edu.au/division/learning-teaching/assessments/supervised-assessment/initiative-update>



Reviewer tip

Quality lens: Relevant [Assessment Design Principles](#) include:

Principle 4 – Assessment is valid and reliable and

Principle 6 – Assessment is designed to ensure academic integrity.

Supervised assessment should generate credible evidence of the intended learning and provide confidence that the performance represents the student's own work.

16. Hurdle Task

System / process – student-facing consequence

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement

Check that Yes/No is correct.

Where Yes is selected, check that students are clearly told:

- ✓ that the task is a hurdle;
- ✓ what they must achieve to pass it;
- ✓ that the hurdle requirement is clearly stated within the Essential Requirements to Pass the Subject; and
- ✓ any applicable resubmission or second-attempt arrangements.



The [Assessment Policy](#) specifies the circumstances in which hurdle assessment may be used.

These student-information requirements are addressed in the [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#).

17. Hurdle Task Description

Not student-facing

Review type: CDAP operational requirement supporting a policy requirement

Check that the internal rationale or description is complete.

Do not assume that completing this field communicates the hurdle requirement to students.



The relevant student-facing hurdle information must separately meet the requirements of the [Assessment Policy](#) and [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#).

18. Centrally Timetabled

Not directly student-facing

Review type: CDAP operational requirement

Check that the setting correctly reflects whether the task is centrally timetabled.

Where **Assessment Type = Examination**, Centrally Timetabled must be Yes for this CDAP process.



The examination administration requirements themselves are set out in the [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#).

19. Examination information

Student-facing – provided through Task Description

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement

For exams and tests, check that students receive the relevant information required by the [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#), including:

- scope of learning or materials being tested;
- duration;
- timing information;
- response format;
- materials supplied by the University; and
- materials students are required or permitted to provide.



For centrally timetabled examinations, also check consistency with the [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#) and the examination cover sheet.

20. Generative AI

System / process – student-facing consequence

Review type: CDAP operational requirement informed by policy and quality standards

Check that Yes/No is appropriate.

Where **Generative AI = Yes**, the Task Description must clearly explain:

- ✓ what use is permitted;
- ✓ any relevant limits; and
- ✓ what students remain responsible for producing themselves.



The broader academic-integrity requirement is supported by the [Assessment Policy](#) and the [Statement of Principles for the use of Artificial Intelligence](#).



Reviewer tip

Quality lens: [Assessment Design Principle 6 – Assessment is designed to ensure academic integrity](#) supports assessment that motivates ethical practice and provides appropriate confidence in student authorship.

21. Task Description

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and quality review standard

The Task now brings together information that may previously have appeared separately under:

- Task description
- Presentation
- Requirements

Check

Confirm that:

- ✓ the opening instruction makes clear what students need to produce or do;
- ✓ the information is written in plain English and student-facing language;
- ✓ all essential task requirements are included;
- ✓ required components are clear;
- ✓ presentation, formatting and submission requirements are clear;
- ✓ variable due-date arrangements are explained where relevant;
- ✓ examination/test information is included where relevant;
- ✓ generative AI permissions are explained where relevant;
- ✓ referencing expectations are included where relevant; and
- ✓ no essential requirement appears only in the Rubric or Brightspace.



The [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#) establishes the assessment information that must be communicated through the Subject Outline.



Reviewer question

If I were a student reading this for the first time, would I know what I need to produce, what requirements apply and how to complete the task?

Quality lens: [Assessment Design Principle 8 – Assessment is clear and explicit](#) expects assessment information to be communicated unambiguously so students understand requirements and performance expectations.

CDAP format

Review type: CDAP operational requirement

The Task Description:

- has a maximum of 10,000 characters;
- ✗ cannot contain tables;
- ✗ cannot contain images; and
- ✗ cannot contain embedded datasets.

Related help:

[Writing Student-Facing Assessment Information in CDAP](#)

22. Rationale

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and quality review standard

Check that the Rationale:

- ✓ explains the educational purpose of the task;
- ✓ does not simply repeat the task instructions; and
- ✓ explains disciplinary, professional or accreditation relevance where appropriate.



The [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#) requires a task rationale in relation to the Subject Learning Outcomes.

The [Assessment Policy](#) requires assessment design to align with learning outcomes.

Reviewer tip

Not every Rationale needs to demonstrate every Principle. Apply those relevant to the purpose of the task.



Quality lens: Depending on the task, relevant [Assessment Design Principles](#) may include:

- **Principle 1 – Assessment is designed to facilitate learning success**
- **Principle 2 – Assessment is purposeful, rigorous, and intellectually challenging**
- **Principle 3 – Assessment is aligned to the outcomes**
- **Principle 5 – Assessment is authentic and aligned to professional knowledge and practice.**

23. Subject Learning Outcomes

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and quality review standard

Check that:

- ✓ selected SLOs are genuinely assessed by the task;
- ✓ the task generates appropriate evidence of their achievement;
- ✓ irrelevant SLOs have not been selected;

- ✓ relevant SLOs have not been omitted; and
- ✓ collectively, assessment provides evidence of the relevant subject outcomes.



The [Assessment Policy](#) requires assessment methods and design to be consistent with the learning outcomes being assessed and capable of confirming their achievement.



Reviewer tip

If the mapping needs to change, leave a comment for the Subject Coordinator rather than changing it yourself.

Quality lens: [Assessment Design Principle 3 – Assessment is aligned to the outcomes](#) and [Principle 4 – Assessment is valid and reliable](#) support assessment that explicitly addresses intended outcomes and generates credible evidence for judgement.

24. Rubric

Student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and quality review standard



The [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#) requires a rubric for assessment tasks, subject to the specified exception for tests and quizzes weighted at 10% or less.

The [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#) requires relevant marking criteria and standards to be communicated to students.

Check

Confirm that the Rubric:

- ✓ aligns with the Task Description and selected SLOs;
- ✓ contains criteria specific to the task;
- ✓ assesses the important features of student performance;
- ✓ uses explicit and assessable criteria;
- ✓ does not introduce requirements absent from the Task Description;

- ✓ provides meaningful performance standards;
- ✓ establishes an appropriate Pass or Satisfactory standard;
- ✓ demonstrates logical progression in quality;
- ✓ makes performance standards self-contained;
- ✓ uses clear and unambiguous language; and
- ✓ meaningfully differentiates achievement levels.

These detailed characteristics are **quality review standards**. They operationalise broader assessment-quality expectations rather than each being a separate policy rule.



The [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#) requires a rubric for assessment tasks, subject to the specified exception for tests and quizzes weighted at 10% or less.

The [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#) requires relevant marking criteria and standards to be communicated to students.



Reviewer tip

Quality lens: Relevant [Assessment Design Principles](#) include:

- **Principle 4 – Assessment is valid and reliable**
- **Principle 7 – Assessment is informed by quality assurance**
- **Principle 8 – Assessment is clear and explicit.**

Together, these support criteria and standards that enable clear, appropriate and defensible judgements while making expectations understandable to students.

CDAP format

Review type: CDAP operational requirement

The Rubric:

- has a maximum of 10,000 characters;
- ✗ cannot contain tables;
- ✗ cannot contain images or embedded datasets; and
- ✗ should use CDAP formatting controls rather than relying on pasted formatting.

Related help:

[Writing Student-Facing Assessment Information in CDAP](#)

25. Feedback Method

Not directly student-facing – with student-facing consequence

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement, quality review standard and CDAP operational requirement

Check that the selected method accurately reflects how feedback will be provided.



The [Assessment Policy](#) and [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#) establish requirements for feedback and return of assessment.



Reviewer tip

As a quality check, also consider whether students have meaningful opportunities to receive feedback that can inform subsequent learning.

Quality lens: Relevant [Assessment Design Principles](#) include:

- **Principle 1 – Assessment is designed to facilitate learning success;** and
- **Principle 11 – Assessment is designed to elicit constructive feedback.**

No Feedback Provided

If **No Feedback Provided** is selected:

- ✓ confirm that this is intentional and appropriate; and
- ✓ note that no return date will be generated for the assessment in the Subject Outline.

Related help:

[Due Dates, Exams, Feedback and Special Assessment Settings](#)

26. Applies to All Offerings

Not directly student-facing

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and CDAP operational requirement



The [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#) requires subject deliveries to remain consistent with the Approved subject and, as far as possible, use the same assessment tasks.

Check that:

- ✓ the correct offering or offerings are selected;
- ✓ an alternative version exists where required;
- ✓ equivalent versions use the intended assessment number;
- ✓ assessment weighting is correct for each offering; and
- ✓ students receive the intended assessment for their offering.

Related help:

[Using Different Assessment for Different Offerings](#)

27. Adding or removing assessment tasks

System / process – substantive assessment change

Review type: Policy / procedure requirement and quality review standard



Changes to assessment tasks require appropriate approval under the [Assessment Policy](#).

Where a task has been added or removed, consider the effect across the whole assessment program:

- weighting;
- numbering;
- SLO coverage;
- Essential Requirements to Pass;
- hurdle requirements;
- group assessment;
- due-date distribution;
- sequencing;
- offering applicability;
- references between tasks; and
- overall coherence.



Reviewer tip

If an issue is identified, leave a comment rather than changing the assessment structure yourself.

Quality lens: Relevant [Assessment Design Principles](#) include:

- **Principle 1 – Assessment is designed to facilitate learning success**
- **Principle 3 – Assessment is aligned to the outcomes**
- **Principle 10 – Assessment is manageable and sequenced**
- **Principle 11 – Assessment is designed to elicit constructive feedback.**

Related help:

[Link to guide: Adding or Removing an Assessment Task in CDAP] Coming soon

28. Indicative Sum of Assessments

Not student-facing

Review type: CDAP operational requirement

Check that assessment weighting is correct.

The indicative total will normally be 100% for weighted assessment.

It may exceed 100% in CDAP where alternative versions of the same assessment exist for different offerings.

Where this occurs, confirm that the assessment applying to **each individual offering** totals correctly.

Using CDAP functionality

Comments during review

- Other than correcting minor typographical errors, reviewers should **not change assessment content directly**.
- Use Comments to request substantive changes.
- Comments should identify the issue clearly enough for the Subject Coordinator to know what needs attention.

Policy / procedure issue



This hurdle requirement does not currently identify what students must achieve to pass the task. Please update the student-facing information to meet the Subject Outline requirements.

Quality review issue



The opening section does not yet make clear what students are required to produce. Please revise the Task Description so the task is clear from a student perspective.

CDAP / operational issue



Assessment Type is set to Examination, but Centrally Timetabled is No. Please review the CDAP configuration.

Other examples:



Generative AI is marked Yes. Please specify in the Task Description what use is permitted.



SLO 2 does not appear to be assessed by any task. Please review the SLO mapping.



The Rubric introduces a requirement that is not stated in the Task Description. Please align the Task Description and Rubric.

- The Subject Coordinator should make the required change and respond within the same comment thread.
- The reviewer then checks that the issue has been resolved.

Related help:

[Using Comments, Track Changes and Field Audit History in CDAP](#)

Using Track Changes

Use **Track Changes** where useful to compare the Proposed version with the previous Approved version.

Pay particular attention to changes in:

- weighting;
- due dates;
- task instructions;
- assessment settings;
- hurdle status;
- SLO mapping;
- Rubrics;
- offering applicability; and
- added or deleted assessment content.

In CDAP:

- **green** indicates added information; and
- **red strikethrough** indicates deleted information.

Related help:

[Using Comments, Track Changes and Field Audit History in CDAP](#)

Using Field Audit History

Use **Field Audit History** where you need more detail about a change to an individual field.

This can be useful where several people have worked on the academic item or where Track Changes does not provide enough context.

Related help:

[Using Comments, Track Changes and Field Audit History in CDAP](#)

DRAFT

Final whole-of-assessment check

Before completing the review, confirm all three dimensions.

Compliant

Confirm that applicable policy and procedure requirements are met, including:

- ✓ Requirements to Pass;
- ✓ SLO alignment;
- ✓ assessment marking arrangements;
- ✓ group-assessment requirements;
- ✓ hurdle requirements;
- ✓ due-date restrictions where applicable;
- ✓ submission arrangements;
- ✓ examination information;
- ✓ criteria and standards;
- ✓ feedback requirements; and
- ✓ required Subject Outline information.

Relevant requirements are contained in the:

- [Assessment Policy](#);
- [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#);
- [Assessment Flexibility Procedure](#);
- [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#); and
- where applicable, [Course and Subject Procedure – Coursework Design](#).

Quality assured

Drawing on the [Charles Sturt Assessment Design Principles](#) where relevant, confirm that:

- ✓ the assessment supports student learning and progress;
- ✓ tasks are purposeful and appropriately challenging;
- ✓ assessment provides valid evidence of the intended SLOs;
- ✓ the design supports academic integrity;

- ✓ students have equitable opportunities to demonstrate learning;
- ✓ assessment information is clear and explicit;
- ✓ workload and sequencing are manageable;
- ✓ Rubrics support appropriate and defensible judgements;
- ✓ professional or authentic relevance is evident where appropriate; and
- ✓ feedback can contribute to subsequent learning.

The reviewer is not required to demonstrate that every assessment task independently satisfies every Assessment Design Principle. Apply the Principles relevant to the assessment and the quality judgement being made.

Operationally correct

Confirm that:

- ✓ the correct Proposed version has been reviewed;
- ✓ field configurations are correct;
- ✓ variable due dates are configured correctly;
- ✓ Examination/Centrally Timetabled settings are consistent;
- ✓ supervised-assessment requirements are met where relevant;
- ✓ Generative AI permissions are included where required;
- ✓ Task Description and Rubric meet CDAP format requirements;
- ✓ offering applicability is correct; and
- ✓ assessment totals are correct for each offering.

Review completion

Finally confirm that:

- all reviewer comments have been addressed; and
- the assessment is **publication ready**.

Completing the assessment review

Once the assessment is:

- **compliant;**
- **quality assured;**
- **operationally correct;** and
- **publication ready,**

add the following comment in CDAP:



Assessment Review Complete

This provides a clear signal that the quality review is complete and the assessment is publication ready.

The Subject Administration Team can then progress the academic item through the agreed process so it returns to an **Approved** state.

Once Approved, assessment information updates into **Shared Data overnight**. It can then be refreshed into the Subject Outline Tool and checked before the Subject Outline progresses to QA.

Reviewer role: at a glance

If you identify...	Reviewer action
Minor spelling or punctuation error	May correct directly
Policy or procedure requirement not met	Leave a comment and do not complete the review until resolved
Quality issue affecting publication readiness	Leave a comment
CDAP configuration or operational issue	Leave a comment
Unclear or incomplete Task Description	Leave a comment
Incorrect due date or weighting	Leave a comment
SLO alignment concern	Leave a comment
Rubric quality or alignment concern	Leave a comment
Missing Generative AI guidance	Leave a comment
Incorrect hurdle or supervised-assessment information	Leave a comment
Examination/Centrally Timetabled inconsistency	Leave a comment
Group-assessment compliance issue	Leave a comment
Offering configuration issue	Leave a comment
All issues resolved and assessment is publication ready	Add Assessment Review Complete

Reviewers quality assure the assessment.

Subject Coordinators remain responsible for substantive changes to their assessment content.

Quick reviewer checklist

Use this checklist as a final scan before adding **Assessment Review Complete**.

Whole assessment

- ☐ I am reviewing the correct **Proposed** version for the correct year.
- ☐ The assessment program is coherent across the subject.
- ☐ Relevant Subject Learning Outcomes are appropriately assessed.
- ☐ Weighting, workload, sequencing and due dates are appropriate.
- ☐ Group, hurdle, supervised and examination arrangements are appropriate where relevant.
- ☐ Offering-specific assessment is configured correctly where relevant.
- ☐ The assessment design appropriately considers academic integrity, learner diversity and student progression.

Policy and procedure requirements

- ☐ Essential Requirements to Pass are accurate and complete.
- ☐ Any hurdle requirements comply with the [Assessment Policy](#).
- ☐ Group assessment meets the requirements of the [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#).
- ☐ Due-date restrictions are met where applicable under the [Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure](#).
- ☐ Assessment information required by the [Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation](#) is included.
- ☐ Seven-day automatic extension settings are consistent with the [Assessment Flexibility Procedure](#).

Student-facing information

- ☐ Task titles, values, dates, length/duration and submission information are correct.
- ☐ Task Descriptions clearly tell students what they need to produce or do.
- ☐ Task Descriptions include relevant Task, Presentation and Requirements information.
- ☐ Variable due dates are clearly explained where applicable.
- ☐ Referencing expectations are included where relevant.
- ☐ Examination or test information is complete where relevant.
- ☐ Generative AI permissions are clear where **Generative AI = Yes**.
- ☐ Rationales explain the educational purpose of the task.
- ☐ SLO selections accurately reflect what the task assesses.

- ☐ Rubrics align with the task and SLOs and provide clear, meaningful standards.
- ☐ No essential assessment requirement appears only in Brightspace or the Rubric.

CDAP and operational checks

- ☐ Assessment Type and other classification fields are correct.
- ☐ **Examination** is used only where **Centrally Timetabled = Yes**.
- ☐ Supervised Assessment is configured correctly where relevant.
- ☐ Hurdle Task and Hurdle Task Description are configured correctly where relevant.
- ☐ Variable due dates are configured using the appropriate CDAP fields.
- ☐ Task Description and Rubric meet CDAP format and character-limit requirements.
- ☐ Applies to All Offerings is correct.
- ☐ The assessment total is correct for each offering.

Review comments

- ☐ I have only corrected minor typographical errors directly.
- ☐ I have left comments for all substantive changes required.
- ☐ The Subject Coordinator has addressed each required change.
- ☐ I have checked the revised information.
- ☐ All reviewer comments are resolved.

Ready to complete

- The assessment is **compliant**.
- The assessment is **quality assured**.
- The assessment is **operationally correct**.
- The assessment is **publication ready**.
- ☐ When all applicable checks are complete, add the comment:

Assessment Review Complete