1. Preamble
2. This example replaces Appendix 1.40(c) of the Academic Policy (December 2010).
3. Definitions
4. For the purpose of this Guideline, refer to the Academic Board's Definitions Policy.
5. Example of Distribution of Grades
6. The following distribution of grades is an example that could be employed for undergraduate awards, except where ranking, such as among Honours students, is required. The method would need to be made explicit to students.

| Grade | Range | Mid Point  (mark for grade) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fail  Pass  Pass+  Credit  Credit+  Distinction  Distinction+  High Distinction | 0 – 49  50 – 64  58 – 64  65 – 74  70 – 74  75 – 84  80 – 84  85 – 100 | 35 (or resubmit)  57  62  69  72  79  82  92 |

1. Each grade be allocated a consistent mark that is the midpoint of the range of marks for each grade. Three of the grade ranges also have a mark assigned for higher level performance (Pass+, Credit+ and Distinction+) to enable students to better gauge their progress during the continuous assessment of each unit. There is no High Distinction+ as HD already denotes superior, outstanding, creative performance on a task. Marks for these '+' grades are the midpoint between the mark allocated for the 'sound' grade and the highest mark in the range. All marks are rounded to the nearest whole number.
2. Marking sheets be designed for each assessment task. The marker's holistic judgment of the quality of student performance in a task is then measured against the grade descriptors to determine 'best fit' to a grade description, out of eight possibilities (Fail/Resubmit, Pass, Pass+, Credit, Credit+, Distinction, Distinction+ or High Distinction).
3. When tasks are unequally weighted, grades to be calculated from the relevant mark for a grade according to their weighting. Marks are needed for each task in order calculate final grades to be awarded for the whole unit of study, although students are provided with letter grades only.