Charles Sturt University

Subject Outline

# Subject Coordinator 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

**Preparing Assessment Information in CDAP** ..... **3**
Guide for Subject Coordinators ..... 3
Faculty and School requirements ..... 3

**Understanding your responsibilities** ..... **4**
Policy and procedure requirements ..... 4
Quality standards ..... 4
CDAP and operational requirements ..... 5
Understanding student-facing and system fields ..... 5

**Subject Coordinator responsibilities** ..... **7**

**Subject Coordinator workflow** ..... **8**
1. Open the correct Proposed version ..... 8
2. Review the assessment program as a whole ..... 8
3. Review and update each assessment item ..... 8
4. Review student-facing information ..... 8
5. Check the assessment against policy, quality and operational requirements ..... 9
6. Save regularly ..... 9
7. Respond to reviewer comments ..... 9
8. Wait for review completion ..... 9

**Subject Coordinator Process** ..... **11**
1. Review the assessment program as a whole ..... 11
2. Essential Requirements to Pass the Subject ..... 12
3. Assessment Information ..... 12
Tables, images and datasets in the Task description ..... 16

**Responding to assessment review comments** ..... **17**
Using Track Changes and Field Audit History ..... 18
Before submitting the assessment for review ..... 19

**Quick Subject Coordinator checklist** ..... **21**

**After the School review** ..... **23**

# Preparing Assessment Information in CDAP

## Guide for Subject Coordinators

This guide supports Subject Coordinators to **review, update and prepare assessment information in CDAP** before it undergoes School quality review and is finalised for publication in the Subject Outline.

As Subject Coordinator, you are responsible for the **substantive assessment content** in the Proposed academic item.

The purpose is not simply to complete the required CDAP fields. Before submitting the assessment for review, you should be satisfied that it is:

- compliant with relevant policy and procedure requirements;
- academically sound and coherent;
- aligned with the Subject Learning Outcomes;
- clear and usable for students;
- appropriately designed for the students and their stage of learning;
- consistent across the assessment program;
- correctly configured in CDAP; and
- ready for School quality review.

The Assessment Policy establishes requirements for assessment design, alignment with learning outcomes, academic integrity, student diversity, feedback and assessment quality. It also establishes the University's Assessment Design Principles as part of the Charles Sturt Curriculum Model.

The substantive assessment information is now reviewed in **CDAP** before it progresses to the Subject Outline. Subject Outline QA later confirms that the Approved assessment information has transferred and displays correctly; it should not be used as the first substantive assessment quality check.

**Related help:**
**Updating Assessment Information: How CDAP and the Subject Outline Tool Work Together**

## Faculty and School requirements

The resources and PD sessions explain how to undertake assessment activities through the CDAP–SOT process and the University requirements that apply. Your Faculty or School may currently have additional expectations or approval arrangements regarding assessment changes. Please check with your Faculty or School if you are unsure what applies to your subject.

# Understanding your responsibilities

Preparing assessment information involves **three different types of responsibility**.

| Type | What it means | Subject Coordinator responsibility |
|---|---|---|
| **Policy / procedure requirement** | A requirement established by a Charles Sturt policy or procedure. | Ensure the assessment complies before submitting it for review. |
| **Quality standard** | An educational quality expectation used to determine whether assessment is clear, coherent, appropriate and effective for learning. | Apply academic and educational judgement when designing and updating the assessment. |
| **CDAP / operational requirement** | A system, CDAP-to-SOT or institutional implementation requirement. | Configure the assessment correctly so the information can be approved and flow correctly to the Subject Outline. |

## Policy and procedure requirements

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

For example:

- assessment design and learning-outcome alignment must meet the Assessment Policy;
- hurdle assessment must meet the circumstances permitted by 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.

The current Assessment Policy also assigns academic leadership responsibility for assessment quality assurance and compliance with the policy and its procedures.

## Quality standards

Quality standards help you determine whether the assessment is not only compliant, but **educationally sound and usable for students**.

Many of these standards are informed by the Charles Sturt Assessment Design Principles.

The Principles support 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.

You are **not expected to demonstrate that every assessment task independently addresses all 11 Principles**. Apply the Principles that are relevant to the assessment design and the decisions you are making.

## 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 a task to be Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory or weighted at 30% or more; and
- where **Generative AI = Yes**, permitted use needing to be explained in the Task Description.

These requirements still need to be met before the assessment can be approved and published, but they should not be treated as policy requirements unless a relevant policy or procedure also applies.

## 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.

When completing these fields, write for the **student audience**, not for reviewers or administrative staff.

**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 that 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 the hurdle requirement must be clearly explained 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.

# Subject Coordinator responsibilities

As Subject Coordinator, you are responsible for the **academic content and accuracy of the assessment information** you submit for review.

This includes:

- reviewing migrated assessment information rather than assuming it is correct;
- making changes where required;
- checking the assessment program as a whole;
- ensuring students receive clear and complete assessment instructions;
- ensuring policy and procedure requirements are met;
- making appropriate academic and educational design decisions;
- configuring the relevant CDAP assessment fields correctly;
- responding to reviewer comments; and
- making the changes required before the assessment can be publication ready.

The reviewer provides **quality assurance and oversight**. The reviewer does not take ownership of your assessment content.

Reviewers may correct minor typographical errors, but substantive changes are returned to the Subject Coordinator through **Comments**.

The reviewer, not the Subject Coordinator, indicates that the review is complete by adding:



Assessment Review Complete

**Related help:**
Reviewer Guide (CDAP)
Using Comments, Track Changes and Field Audit History in CDAP

# Subject Coordinator workflow

## 1. Open the correct Proposed version

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

**Related help:**
Finding the Correct Subject Version and Editing Assessment in CDAP

## 2. Review the assessment program as a whole

Before editing individual fields, review:

- SLO coverage;
- number and type of tasks;
- weighting;
- sequencing;
- workload;
- due dates;
- feedback opportunities;
- group, hurdle, supervised and examination arrangements; and
- offering-specific assessment where relevant.

## 3. Review and update each assessment item

Work through the fields in CDAP and update the information where required.

Do not assume that migrated information is complete simply because a field contains content.

## 4. Review student-facing information

Pay particular attention to:

- Task Description;
- Rationale;
- SLOs;
- Rubric;
- dates and length;
- submission information;
- group requirements;

- hurdle requirements;
- examination information; and
- generative AI permissions.

## 5. Check the assessment against policy, quality and operational requirements

Before submitting it for review, make sure it is:

- **compliant**;
- **quality assured**; and
- **operationally correct**.

## 6. Save regularly

Save after completing an assessment item or making substantial changes.

If CDAP will not save, check:

- mandatory fields;
- Task Description and Rubric character limits;
- conditional fields; and
- validation messages.

## 7. Respond to reviewer comments

When the reviewer requests changes:

- review the comment;
- make the required change;
- save the updated assessment;
- reply in the same comment thread; and
- leave the assessment available for the reviewer to recheck.

## 8. Wait for review completion

The reviewer will add a comment when all review issues have been resolved, and the assessment is publication ready.



Assessment Review Complete

# Subject Coordinator Process

## 1. Review the assessment program as a whole

**Responsibility type: Quality standard informed by policy and the Assessment Design Principles**

Before updating individual fields, consider the assessment program across the subject.

Ask:

- ☐ Do the tasks collectively assess the relevant SLOs?
- ☐ Does each task have a clear purpose?
- ☐ Is the level of challenge appropriate for the students' stage of learning?
- ☐ Does assessment build or progress appropriately across the subject?
- ☐ Are the number, type and weighting of tasks reasonable?
- ☐ Is workload proportionate and manageable?
- ☐ Are due dates appropriately distributed?
- ☐ Does the design provide equitable opportunities for students to demonstrate their learning?
- ☐ Does the assessment appropriately manage academic-integrity risk?
- ☐ Can students receive and use feedback to improve?
- ☐ Are group, hurdle, supervised and examination arrangements educationally justified?
- ☐ Where assessment differs between offerings, does the overall design remain coherent?

The Assessment Policy requires assessment methods and design to align with learning outcomes, validly confirm achievement, support criterion-referenced judgement and address matters including student diversity and academic integrity.

**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

**Responsibility type: Policy / procedure requirement where applicable**

Not every subject is required to contain an early assessment simply because this was previously included in Subject Outline QA.

Where your subject has been designed to fulfil the course-level early assessment requirement, ensure that it continues to do so in accordance with the Course and Subject Procedure – Coursework Design.

## 2. Essential Requirements to Pass the Subject

**Student-facing**
**Responsibility type: Policy / procedure requirement**

Ensure that this field:

- clearly states what students must do to pass the subject;
- accurately reflects the assessment program;
- includes relevant hurdle requirements;
- does not refer to tasks that have been removed or renumbered; and
- can be readily understood by students.

The Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation establishes requirements for the information students must receive about assessment and passing the subject.

Where a hurdle is used, ensure it is permitted under the Assessment Policy.

## 3. Assessment Information

| Field | Student-facing status | Responsibility type | Key Subject Coordinator responsibility | Key policy / quality / operational point |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Number** | Student-facing | CDAP operational + quality | Ensure numbering is correct and consistent, including equivalent offering-specific versions. | Recheck references if tasks are added, removed or reordered. |
| **Task Title** | Student-facing | Quality standard | Use a clear, concise title that students can readily identify.<br><br>No special characters have been used in the title (e.g. / " < > + = \| , %). | Keep terminology consistent with the Task Description and learning materials. |
| **Value and Weighting Type** | Student-facing | Policy/procedure + CDAP operational | Enter the correct value and select **Weighting %** or **Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory** appropriately. | Check weighting across the program and for each offering. Assessment – Conduct of Coursework Assessment and Examinations Procedure. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Duration / Length** | Student-facing | Quality standard informed by policy | State an appropriate length/duration and make the expected scope clear. | Workload should be reasonable for the weighting and complexity. **Assessment Design Principle 10 – Manageable and sequenced.** |
| **Due Date** | Student-facing | Policy/procedure where applicable + quality | Set the correct date and position it appropriately within the subject. | Consider preparation time and other assessment. Final-exam subjects must meet timing restrictions in the Assessment – Conduct Procedure. **Principle 10 – Manageable and sequenced.** |
| **Due Supplementary Information** | Student-facing | Policy/procedure + CDAP operational | For variable dates, leave Due Date blank and explain timing here and in the Task Description. | Students must still receive clear timing information. Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation. |
| **Assessment Type** | Not directly student-facing | CDAP operational | Select the correct classification. | **Only centrally timetabled assessments can be classified as Examination in CDAP.** |
| **Method of Assessment** | Not directly student-facing | CDAP classification | Where used, select the method that best describes the assessment. | Optional field. |
| **Submission Method** | Student-facing | Policy/procedure + CDAP operational | Select the method students will actually use. | Ensure it is consistent with the Task Description. |
| **Individual or Group** | System/ process with student-facing consequence | Policy/procedure | Select correctly and ensure group assessment requirements are met. | Group information must explain assessment, marks, group formation, support and management. Assessment Policy and Assessment – Conduct Procedure. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Individual Component** | Student-facing | Policy/procedure where applicable + quality | Clearly explain any individual component and how it contributes to the task. | Align it with the Task Description and Rubric. |
| **7 day auto extend** | Not directly student-facing | Policy/procedure + CDAP operational | Select Yes/No according to whether the automatic extension applies. | Must align with the Assessment Flexibility Procedure. |
| **Supervised Assessment** | Not directly student-facing | Institutional/CDAP operational | Select Yes where the assessment meets the supervised-assessment model. | Must be **SY/US or weighted 30%+**. Quality lens: **Principle 4 – Valid and reliable** and **Principle 6 – Academic integrity**. |
| **Hurdle Task** | System/ process with student-facing consequence | Policy/procedure | Use only where permitted and tell students what they must achieve to pass. | Governed by the Assessment Policy; student information by the Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation. |
| **Hurdle Task Description** | Not student-facing | CDAP operational supporting policy | Complete the internal rationale/description. | Do not rely on this field to communicate the hurdle to students. |
| **Centrally Timetabled** | Not directly student-facing | CDAP operational | Select Yes only where the assessment is centrally timetabled. | **Assessment Type = Examination requires Centrally Timetabled = Yes.** |
| **Examination information** | Student-facing through Task Description | Policy/procedure | Include scope, duration, timing, response format and permitted/required materials. | Must align with the Course and Subject Procedure – Information and Representation, and for central exams the Assessment – Conduct Procedure. |
| **Generative AI** | System/ process with student-facing consequence | CDAP operational informed by policy/quality | Select Yes/No and, where Yes, explain permitted use, limits and student responsibility in the Task Description. | Quality lens: **Principle 6 – Academic integrity**. Also see Assessment Policy and AI Principles. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Task Description** | Student-facing | Policy/procedure + quality + CDAP operational | Give students all information needed to understand and complete the task, incorporating **Task, Presentation, Requirements, and GenAI instructions** where it is being permitted to be used. | Clear instructions, and requirements. **Principle 8 – Clear and explicit.**<br><br>Max **10,000 characters**; no tables, images or embedded datasets. |
| **Rationale** | Student-facing | Policy/procedure + quality | Explain why the assessment matters. | Include educational, disciplinary/professional or accreditation purpose where relevant. Quality lens may include **Principles 1, 2, 3 and 5**. |
| **Subject Learning Outcomes** | Student-facing | Policy/procedure + quality | Select only SLOs genuinely assessed and ensure overall assessment coverage remains appropriate. | **Principle 3 – Aligned to outcomes** and **Principle 4 – Valid and reliable**. |
| **Rubric** | Student-facing | Policy/procedure + quality + CDAP operational | Provide task-specific criteria and meaningful performance standards aligned to the task and SLOs. | Do not introduce new task requirements. Quality lens: **Principles 4, 7 and 8**.<br><br>Max **10,000 characters**; no tables, images or datasets. |
| **Feedback Method** | Not directly student-facing, with student-facing consequence | Policy/procedure + quality + CDAP operational | Select how students will receive feedback. | Consider whether feedback can inform subsequent learning. **Principles 1 and 11.**<br><br>**No Feedback Provided** means no return date is generated. |
| **Applies to All Offerings** | Not directly student-facing | Policy/procedure + CDAP operational | Select 'Yes' where the same assessment applies to all offerings; otherwise configure the correct offering-specific versions. | Equivalent versions may retain the same assessment number; ensure weighting is correct for each offering. |
| **Indicative Sum of Assessments** | Not student-facing | CDAP operational | Check the weighting total. | Normally 100%.<br><br>It may exceed 100% where offering-specific alternatives exist, provided **each** |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **individual offering totals correctly**. |

## Tables, images and datasets in the Task description

Where a table, image, dataset or other content included in the Task description **cannot be accurately converted into accessible text within CDAP**, the content must be:

1. uploaded to **DOMS**; and
2. hyperlinked from the **Task description in CDAP**.

The Task description should include enough information for students to understand what the linked resource contains and how it relates to the assessment task.

Do not omit the content from the assessment information simply because it cannot be reproduced directly in CDAP. The DOMS link must be included in the Task description so that it is available to students through the Subject Outline.

**Related help:**

DOMS Help

# Responding to assessment review comments

The reviewer may leave Comments against assessment information where changes or clarification are required.

The reviewer may directly fix a minor typo, but **substantive changes remain your responsibility as Subject Coordinator**.

When you receive a comment:

1. read the issue carefully;
2. review the relevant assessment information;
3. make the required change;
4. consider whether the change has consequences elsewhere in the assessment program;
5. save the updated information; and
6. reply within the same comment thread.

A reviewer comment may relate to:

- a **policy or procedure requirement**;
- an **assessment quality issue**; or
- a **CDAP / operational issue**.

Examples include:



Please clarify what students are required to produce for this task.



The selected SLO does not appear to be assessed by this task. Please review the SLO mapping.



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



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



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

If you need clarification about a reviewer comment, use the comment thread or the agreed School process rather than making an assumption about the requested change.

**Related help:**
Using Comments, Track Changes and Field Audit History in CDAP

## Using Track Changes and Field Audit History

You can use **Track Changes** to compare the Proposed version with the previous Approved version.

This is particularly useful when checking changes to:

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

In CDAP:

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

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

**Related help:**
Using Comments, Track Changes and Field Audit History in CDAP

## Before submitting the assessment for review

Before the School reviewer begins, check all three dimensions.

1. **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.

2. **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.

You do not need to demonstrate that every task independently satisfies every Assessment Design Principle. Apply the Principles relevant to the assessment and the design decisions involved.

3. **Operationally correct**

Confirm that:

- you have edited the correct Proposed version;
- mandatory fields are complete;
- field configurations are correct;
- variable due dates are configured correctly;
- Examination and Centrally Timetabled settings are consistent;
- supervised-assessment requirements are met where applicable;
- 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.

# Quick Subject Coordinator checklist

Use this before submitting the assessment for School quality review.

**Whole assessment**

- ☐ I am working in the correct **Proposed** version for the correct year.
- ☐ The assessment program is coherent.
- ☐ Relevant SLOs 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.
- ☐ I have considered student diversity, academic integrity and student progression.

**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.
- ☐ Relevant Task, Presentation and Requirements information has been incorporated.
- ☐ 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 assessment.
- ☐ SLO selections accurately reflect what the task assesses.
- ☐ Rubrics align with the task and SLOs and contain 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.
- ☐ Seven-day auto-extension is configured correctly.
- ☐ Task Description and Rubric meet character and formatting requirements.
- ☐ Applies to All Offerings is correct.

- Assessment totals are correct for each offering.
- I have saved the academic item successfully.

**Ready for review**

- The assessment is **compliant**.
- The assessment is **quality assured**.
- The assessment is **operationally correct**.
- I am satisfied that the assessment is ready for School quality review.

# After the School review

Respond to all reviewer Comments and make the required substantive changes.

Once the reviewer is satisfied, they will add:



Assessment Review Complete

This indicates that the assessment has completed School quality review and is **publication ready**.

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

Once Approved, the 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.

Do not send the Subject Outline to QA until the correct assessment information has:

1. reached **Approved** status in CDAP;
2. updated into Shared Data overnight;
3. been refreshed into the Subject Outline Tool; and
4. been checked in the Subject Outline.

The substantive assessment review should not need to be repeated during Subject Outline QA.

**Related help:**
**Refreshing Approved Assessment Information into the Subject Outline Tool**