



## Assessment Policy

*Approved Date: 27<sup>th</sup> August 2006*

*Revised Date: 19<sup>th</sup> March 2017*

*Revision Effective from: 16<sup>th</sup> July 2017*

### 1. Policy Statement

Valid and reliable assessment practices are the hallmark of quality control in the University. This policy sets out broad parameters surrounding the assessment of student learning in subjects (units) of study at The Maldives National University.

In instances where this broad policy does not fit particular objectives of a subject, Faculties, institutes or other divisions of the University may make variations more sensitive to the needs of a particular subject or discipline. However, such Faculty-level policies must not conflict with the overall spirit of this general policy. Faculty-level variations of this policy should be approved by a Faculty-based academic review committee prior to the commencement of the courses which may be governed by it. It is mandatory to write down all policies and made publicly available.

### 2. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that assessment practices within the University are consistent and valid. A published policy ensures transparency of operations. It is also designed to ensure that all necessary and appropriate information about subject assessments is clearly communicated to all students and to all staff involved in teaching and/or marking of assessment tasks.

This broad policy sets out a general framework for guiding assessment practices. Regulations governing assessment are in a separate document.

### 3. Definitions

**Faculty:** For the purposes of this policy, Faculty refers to Institute, Centre, School or other Academic Unit with a major responsibility for teaching students. Dean or Head refers to the person charged with the running of the Faculty.

**Assessment tasks:** For the purposes of this policy, an assessment task shall be defined as any compulsory or optional activity or exercise where one explicit intent is to assess student progress or learning achievement in a subject of study. Assessment tasks may have other ancillary objectives stated in Section 4.2.

**Aggregate mark:** An aggregate mark is defined as the final numerical mark computed for any student on the basis of combining the outcomes from two or more distinct assessment tasks. Aggregate combining rules may be based on either a simple averaging principle (all tasks counting equally) or a weighted averaging principle (where tasks are differentially weighted). If there is a need to standardize marks this task should precede the aggregation process. However, to ensure statistical validity, only sets of marks where such validity can be maintained should be standardized or scaled.

**Grades:** A grade is the final alphabetic letter conversion of the aggregate mark attained by a student undertaking a subject. The letter conversions translate the numerical aggregate mark into a statement of level of achievement as defined in the Uniform Grading System Policy. The interpretation of a grade shall be clearly taken to represent a summary of the student's academic achievement in a subject. Letter conversions that indicate special outcomes from a subject of study, such as Failed Conditional, various types of withdrawal and unavailability of results shall not be considered as grades in the context of this policy.

**Minimum pass mark:** A cutoff score set by the subject coordinator, that a student must exceed on one or more specific assessment tasks in order to obtain a passing grade for the subject. By definition, University policy is that the minimum pass mark for an aggregate mark in any subject is 50%. However, it is possible to establish a minimum pass mark for any specific assessment task (for example, a formal final examination, a practicum, or clinic), which means that a student must pass that specific assessment task, at the required level, in order to pass the entire subject, irrespective of the magnitude of the student's final aggregate mark. Minimum pass marks should be set with clear criteria in mind.

**Subject:** A discrete component or unit within a degree or other course of study assessed separately.

**Subject coordinator:** Lead Academic staff responsible for organizing teaching, classrooms, students, time, assignments, examinations together so that the objectives of a particular subject may be achieved.

**Internal student:** A student who undertakes all subjects for which they are enrolled through attendance at the institution on a regular basis OR a student who is undertaking a higher degree program for which regular attendance is not required, but who attends the institution on an agreed schedule for the purposes of supervision and/or instruction.

**External Student:** A student whose registered course involves special arrangements whereby lesson materials, assignments etc. are delivered to the

student, and any associated attendance at the institution is of an incidental, irregular, special or voluntary nature.

**Unaided Capability of a Student:** An assessment or any part of an assessment that is carried out under supervision and can be verified as the work of an individual student.

## 4. Assessment at University

Proper assessment of students is essential to achieve the University objectives. Therefore, assessment should be seen as an integral part of the teaching and learning process. Further, assessment has a political dimension as its outcome sometimes leads to investigations, appeals and representations. Therefore, the more transparent this judgment process is, the less room there is for ambiguities and possible disagreements. This University policy is designed to ensure that maximal transparency.

Staff should deem all assessment tasks, tools, instruments and procedures as public and all records and documentations relating to assessment need to be archived within the relevant division of the University.

### 4.1 Considerations for assessment in subjects

Assessment in the context of a subject of study is an individualized process requiring significant academic judgment in its conceptualization, design, and execution. While it is neither possible nor desirable to delineate or anticipate all of the different potential types of assessment tasks that could be designed for a specific subject of study, there are important considerations that broadly cut across all assessment tasks. The types of assessment strategy selected should match well with the goals and objectives of the subject.

### 4.2 Purposes of Assessment

The purposes of assessment are:

- 4.2.1 to judge performance and to determine the extent to which a particular student has attained the stated learning objectives of a subject
- 4.2.2 to determine whether a particular student has sufficient pre-requisite competencies to proceed to the next level of instruction;
- 4.2.3 to provide feedback to students on their performance and to indicate and diagnose misunderstandings and learning difficulties;
- 4.2.4 to provide feedback to staff to indicate areas in which students are experiencing difficulties and to identify and diagnose ineffective teaching; and

4.2.5 To promote learning.

### 4.3 Assessment tasks

#### 4.3.1 Types of tasks

Different expectations apply to assessment tasks depending upon whether or not the task is undertaken under formal examination conditions.

**4.3.1.1 Non-examination tasks:** Assessment tasks designed for completion under non-examination conditions (e.g., periodic assignments throughout a semester of study, major papers due at the end of a semester, research reports, problem sets, and laboratory or practicum reports, various types of construction, composition, or performance) provide maximal flexibility for student assessment. Each task should be considered for its appropriateness relative to the learning to be assessed, the feedback to be gained and clarity in structure, intent and expected response. Each task should also be designed so students lacking the opportunity to access key supplemental resources (e.g., the Internet, library, employment settings) are not systematically disadvantaged.

**4.3.1.2 Examination tasks:** Assessment tasks to be undertaken under examination conditions, which are explicitly supervised, timed and controlled, must be designed to be fully completed within the space of *two* or *three* hours as appropriate. Tests that are designed so that no student will actually complete the test within the assigned time (the mark therefore being the number of items completed that were correct) are not permitted because performance is inseparably confounded with reading speed and ability. Examination questions should address learning outcomes explicitly expected during the subject of study and students must be clear as to the learning outcomes they should expect to be covered in the examination.

**4.3.1.3** Students in a subject may request a variation to the assessment methods to be used in the subject and the variation should be negotiated with the subject coordinator.

**4.3.1.4** Failed assessment tasks, other than examinations, may be resubmitted within provisions indicated by the subject coordinator. Where this provision applies it must do so equally to all students who have failed the exercise. The original mark assigned will stand unless superseded by a higher mark achieved as a result of resubmission.

**4.3.1.5** Students have the right to appeal to the ARC on any assessment matter.

### **4.3.2 Amount of assessment**

**4.3.2.1** It is recognized that different disciplines and teaching philosophies may lead to different perceptions about what the appropriate amount of assessment should be for a specific subject of study. However, every subject must have at least one non-examination assessment task if a formal final examination is planned. The amount of work expected from any student across all assessment tasks should relate to the credit point value of the subject and with the complexity of the material under study. Faculties, institutes and other divisions should develop their own clear expectations about student assessment workloads in the subjects that they offer.

**4.3.2.2** However, as a general principle, no component of assessment should count for more than 70% of the final mark, except with the approval of Faculty-based Academic Review Committee.

**4.3.2.3** As part of all assessment students should produce at least one piece of written individual work from which the unaided capability of a student could be assessed.

**4.3.2.4** At least 50% of the final mark should be from assessments which assess the unaided capability of a student.

**4.3.2.5** All students are required to achieve 50% from assessments which assess the unaided capability of a student.

**4.3.2.6** No subject should require all home-written assignments to reduce incidences of third-party involvement in writing assignments for individual students. Where home-written assessments constitute more than 50% of aggregate marks, the assessment regime of such subjects needs to be approved by the Academic Review Committee.

### **4.3.3 Weighting of assessment tasks**

Consideration must be given to the appropriate weighting to be given to each assessment task when computing aggregate marks. In many cases, a simple average may be used which means that each task carries equal weight. Alternatively, assessment tasks may be weighted in terms of their relative importance, expected word length, difficulty or complexity, or amount of subject material that is expected to be covered. In these cases, the rationale for the weighting system must be clear. For some subjects, a 'sliding weights' system may be employed where doing fewer (or more)

optional assignments may be traded off against increasing (or decreasing) weight on a formal final examination.

## 5. Grading standards

### 5.1 Criterion-referenced assessment

Subject coordinators are expected, as far as is practical and reasonable, to organize assessment tasks so as to measure student learning on a criterion-referenced basis. This means that clear expectations should be set out as to the expected level of achievement, skill or behavioral performance that will be taken to reflect a particular level of mark or grade. The standards of performance will be established on the basis of the professional judgment of the subject coordinator. There will be no pre-determined distribution of grade allocation applied to assessments in University subjects. Examinations must not be norm-referenced and statistical treatments of marks that are based on the normal distribution should not be used if the population size is less than 30.

### 5.2 Grading system

The following grades are used in the University for reporting results of all assessments.

Level of Achievement	Equivalent Marks Range	Grade point	Meaning
HD	85-100	4	High Distinction: Denotes work of outstanding quality. This grade may be awarded to recognize particular originality or creativity in performance.
DN	75-84	3	Distinction: Denotes work of predominantly excellent quality, demonstrating a sound grasp of content together with efficient organization, selectivity and use of techniques.
CR	65-74	2	Credit: Denotes a clear pass and satisfactory achievement of unit objectives.
PP	50-64	1	Pass: Denotes a clear pass.
FC	45-49	0	Fail Conditional: Denotes a student has failed to achieve sufficient knowledge of learning, but after further study and tuition may be reassessed.
FF	0-44	0	Denotes that the candidate has failed to complete the unit satisfactorily

I	0-100	-	Incomplete: An Incomplete is given only when the student has been in attendance and has done satisfactory work until within two weeks of the end of the quarter and has furnished proof satisfactory to the lecturer that the work cannot be completed because of illness or other circumstances beyond the student's control. A written statement of the reason for the giving of the Incomplete, listing the work which the student will need to do to remove it, must be filed by the lecturer with the head of the department or the dean of the faculty in which the subject is given. A "contract" of conditions for completion and time limit, not to exceed 6 weeks within the next semester will be executed by the lecturer and signed by both the lecturer and student. If the terms to remove the grade of "I" are not fulfilled by the end of the sixth week, the grade will become "FF".
DF	Deferred 0-100	-	Assessment task(s) have been deferred
SA	-	-	Satisfactory: This grade is assigned for subjects that are usually marked as either "pass" or "fail". Satisfactory refers to a passing level achievement.
US	-	-	Unsatisfactory: This grade is assigned for subjects that are usually marked as either "pass" or "fail". Unsatisfactory refers to a failing achievement.
WD	-	-	Withdrawn: This grade is assigned when the student officially withdraws in the allocated time period.
WF	-	-	Withdrawn Fail: This grade is assigned when the student does not follow the University's official withdrawal policy by the subject withdrawal deadline or is dropped for excessive absences. This is the equivalent of an "FF" grade.
AU	-	-	Audit.
XC	-	-	Cross Credit.
CC	-	-	Continuing Class: Assigned when a student is unable to complete work during the current semester because of class scheduling over consecutive semesters or at the discretion of the lecturer to allow additional time to complete work. A "contract" of conditions for completion and time limit, not to exceed 12 months, will be executed by the lecturer and signed by both the lecturer and student. If the terms to remove the grade of "CC" are not fulfilled by the end of the contract period, the grade will revert to "FF".
NR	-	-	Results not released: This grade is assigned to subjects when the results are not released due to misconduct or other reasons.
P	-	-	Pass for Short Courses: Applies to non-credit courses. Grades of P are not included in GPA calculations.
F	-	-	Fail for Short Courses: Applies to non-credit courses. Grades of F are not included in GPA calculations.

## 5.2.1 Grade Reports

**5.2.1.1** The above grading system will apply for all courses and certificates. Courses for which an overseas Institution through a formal link agreement gives awards will abide by the grading structures of the link institution.

**5.2.1.2** At the close of each semester, grades or grade reports or results of assessments shall be made available to students. Students are encouraged to keep grade reports and other records pertaining to their academic record.

## 5.2.2 Reviewing Assessment Marks and Grades

**5.2.2.1** If students have grievances concerning assessable work they should approach the subject lecturer with their request for explanation and/or remarking. If the grievance is unresolved then they should contact the subject coordinator, course coordinator, the Dean, in this order, the next person only after receiving an unsatisfactory resolution from the previous person on the list.

**5.2.2.2** Any student who believes that the aggregate mark or grade awarded does not reflect their performance in the subject has the right to approach the subject coordinator and, if necessary, the Dean and have the grading explained or reviewed.

**5.2.2.3** If a student believes there has been a lack of due process in the reassessment procedure, such students may formally appeal to the Academic Review Committee to review the matter. The letter of appeal must state fully the reasons for the appeal and include any relevant documentary evidence to support such appeal. Please note, however, that the Committee's role is to ensure that the proper procedures have been followed in relation to the assessment of the subject—the Committee's role is not to reassess the academic quality of the work.

## 5.2.3 Grade Point Average

**5.2.3.1** The Grade Point Average is a calculation which reflects the overall grades of a student. The grade point average is calculated by dividing the total number of grade points earned by the total number of letter-graded subjects completed. It can be calculated at the end of each semester as well as progressively as a cumulative GPA. Only FF, WF, PP, CR, DN and HD grades are used in GPA calculations.

**5.2.3.2** The following formula may be used to calculate the GPA.

$$\text{GPA} = \frac{4A + 3B + 2C + 1D}{E}$$

Where:

- A* is the number of credit points gained at HD grade
- B* is the number of credit points gained at DN grade
- C* is the number of credit points gained at CR grade
- D* is the number of credit points gained at PP grade
- E* is the sum of credit points for subjects for which the student obtained FF, WF, PP, CR, DN and HD.

#### **5.2.4 Change of Grades**

Students who believe that a computational error occurred in grading must immediately contact the lecturer of the subject in question. Students must bring this matter to the attention of the lecturer involved no later than 10 days after the marks of the subject have been given in order for a grade change to be considered. Administrative personnel of the University are not authorized to change a lecturer's grade.

#### **5.2.5 Repeating a Subject**

When a subject is repeated, only the highest grade earned is utilized in computing the grade point average. A student who repeats a subject should notify the Registrar for re computation of cumulative grade point average. If a student repeats a subject for which an FF was obtained both grades will be included in calculating GPA.

## **6. Responsibility for assessment**

Ultimate responsibility for the production and verification of individual student grades rests with the subject coordinator and the Dean of the Faculty. Academic Review Committee will review and approve the grades submitted by subject coordinators for all subjects offered within a semester, but will not have the right to unilaterally alter the final grade for any subject for an individual student without the written or verbal (if given in a committee) consent of the subject coordinator.

### **6.1 Subject coordinator and other teaching staff**

It is the responsibility of the Dean and subject coordinators to ensure that all subject assessment is conducted fairly, competently, effectively, and in conformity with subject objectives. It is recognized that piloting of examination papers, especially multiple-choice questions is desirable. Where necessary, this should be done by the subject coordinator. The University expects the nominated coordinator for a subject (along with any other teaching staff if the subject is team-taught) will undertake a

reasonable portion of the assessment marking for that subject. The subject coordinator must have active oversight of all aspects of assessment including the production of the final aggregate marks for each student and maintenance of appropriate records of each student's individual assessment task results.

## 6.2 Casual and other marking support

Subject coordinators may enlist, with the agreement of the Dean, competent casual support for marking assessment tasks as may be required to cope with the marking load for a subject.

## 6.3 Monitoring of grading standards

### 6.3.1 Moderation

In order to ensure transparency and fairness in the marking of student assignments and examinations it is necessary to have clearly articulated procedures in place for the moderation of grades assigned to student work.

**6.3.1.1 Moderation within subjects:** In order to ensure that criteria for marking assignments and examinations are applied equitably and fairly by all staff when more than one staff member is teaching in a subject, the following procedure should be followed:

*(a) Establishment of criteria* – Criteria for marking should be developed collaboratively by all staff teaching in the one subject or by the subject co-coordinator.

*(b) Understanding and Interpreting Criteria* – All staff should meet and discuss their understanding and interpretation of criteria.

*(c) Moderation processes* – Staff should mark a sample of papers across the range of grades, for example a high distinction, distinction, credit, pass and fail. These sample papers should be shared by all staff teaching in the subject to ensure that there is agreement about the standard and interpretation of criteria. Staff should then complete the marking of papers using these sample papers as a reference for standards applied. At the completion of marking the subject co-coordinator should review the marks to ensure some level of parity, although it would not necessarily be expected that all groups of students receive the same distribution of grades.

*(d) Failing grades* – All papers that are assigned a failing grade should be remarked by another lecturer. If the lecturer confirms the fail then the paper should be signed by the second marker as evidence of this confirmation. If the fail is not confirmed then an appropriate grade should be assigned to the assessment.

(e) *Moderation in subjects with only one marker* – In such cases it is likely that criteria will be applied fairly by a single marker. However, when there is an unusually high or low distribution of grades then the staff member should review the criteria used for marking to check how well the criteria discriminate between students.

**6.3.1.2 Moderation in Subjects with large numbers:** To ensure equity in marking of subjects that are taken by all students in a subject (core compulsory subjects not electives) with high numbers of students in the subject (more than 100 students), moderation should be carried out if 35% or higher number of students attain distinction and above OR a fail grade.

### **6.3.2 Between subjects – subjects with anomalous grade distributions**

Faculties are responsible for periodically reviewing the distributions of grades emerging from various subjects under their jurisdiction with a view toward identifying any anomalous trends (e.g., excessively high fail rates in specific subjects) that should be addressed.

## **6.4 Group-based versus individual assessment**

It is a normal expectation of University students that they individually and personally complete and submit assessment tasks for any subject they are enrolled in. However, in certain disciplines, it may make pedagogical sense to set group-based assessment tasks that are then assessed. In such tasks, the policy for assigning grades must be clearly documented. Subject coordinators should be aware of the fact that group-based assessment means a necessary confounding of individual student contributions and that specifically documented procedures must be put in place to address this. Such procedures may include assigning a single identical mark to all group members based upon group performance or seeking group member input into individual contributions to the group work and using this feedback to assist in the assignment of marks. However, under no circumstances should any group-based assessment, counting toward the aggregate mark for the subject, be placed entirely in the hands of the group members themselves. Subject coordinators need to be aware that group dynamics often lead to one of few members doing most of the assigned work.

It is recognized that there may be subjects where, for pedagogical reasons, student self-assessments are sought as a valuable source of input into the assessment process. However, these self-assessments must always be obtained in context with assessment judgments made by the subject coordinator. Under no circumstances should any individually-based assessment, counting toward the aggregate mark for the subject, be placed entirely in the hands of the students themselves.

## **6.5 Assessing internal and external students**

Normally, all students will be expected to undertake the same assessment tasks, regardless of their status as internal or external students. In such cases, assessment tasks will need to be constructed with the off-campus resource needs of external students in mind. However, there may be circumstances where, for sound pedagogical or resource-access reasons, different assessment tasks need to be set for internal and external students. In such cases, the overall workload and coverage of subject content associated with assessment tasks, counting toward the aggregate mark for the subject, shall be equivalent between internal and external students.

External students must follow University regulations on examinations. It is the responsibility of the appropriate Dean to ensure that the examinations held off-campus are conducted in conformity with the regulations of the examinations.

## **6.6 Staff development regarding assessment**

Where possible, the Dean in association with the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) shall provide opportunities for staff to improve or extend their capabilities in the area of student assessment through workshops and other activities. Periodic Faculty-based reviews of subject assessment practices and outcomes can also serve a staff development function and can provide a useful platform for facilitating the spread of good practice throughout the Faculty through mentoring and sharing of successes and strategies.

## **6.7 Late assignment submission**

It is a normal expectation that Faculties will develop a policy for handling late assessment task submission by students in their subjects. This policy must be documented in written form and included in the subject materials for subjects taught within the Faculties. The policy must be adhered to uniformly. Whatever policy is created within the Faculty, it should be clearly linked with any policy for seeking extensions on assessment task due dates.

## **6.8 Return of Marked Assessment Tasks**

Written assessment tasks should be marked and returned to the students within three weeks of the date on which the task was due. Staff needs to be aware of the value of early feedback especially in promoting learning.

## **7. Advice to students regarding assessment**

### **7.1 Documentation**

It is the immediate responsibility of the subject coordinator and the ultimate responsibility of the relevant Dean to ensure that sufficient information about subject assessment is included in subject documentation sent to or handed out to all internal and external students. Examination time table must be given to students at least two weeks before the time the examination is to take place. It is recognized that, in many cases, the following list encompasses what is currently best practice in some Faculties.

- 7.1.1** Clear and unambiguous specification of each assessment task in terms of what is to be done, what is to be addressed, expected formatting and style to be employed and other writing requirements. This must include a clear statement on whether or not each assessment task is to be considered compulsory or optional and a specific statement regarding the due date and whether or not, for external students, the due date is a posting date or a 'received at COL' date.
- 7.1.2** Clear and unambiguous specification of how each assessment task will be marked including: the criteria for marking, an indication, where possible, of whether or not other people besides the members of the teaching team are likely to be involved in the marking, how the marking process will be monitored/controlled by the subject coordinator; and an indication of whether or not spelling and grammar will form an explicit part of the marking criteria.
- 7.1.3** Clear and unambiguous specification of the overall marking policy for the subject including: how assessment task outcomes will be scaled (if applicable), weighted and aggregated to yield a final grade and information about and rationale for minimum pass marks (if any are set) and how they will impact on the final grading system.
- 7.1.4** Clear and unambiguous specification of the Faculty's late assignment submission policy and how extensions to due dates may be sought.
- 7.1.5** Clear and unambiguous specification of how long a turn-around time for marked assignment return students may expect, on average. Where possible, this turn-around time must, (maximum 3 weeks), be arranged so that students have a very high probability of receiving feedback on an earlier assessment task before the next assessment task is due to be submitted.

**7.1.6** Clear and unambiguous specification, where appropriate, of the form, substance, extent of subject coverage and weighting of a formal final examination, including its length and the types of questions to expect. This should be accompanied by sample examination questions with answers or sample responses so students clearly understand what they will encounter in the examination and what types of reasoning/levels of learning they will need to demonstrate.

### **7.1.7 Internal students**

**7.1.7.1** Clear and written documentation regarding all aspects of assessment relevant to the specific subject of study must be circulated to all enrolled internal students within the first week of lectures. Students must be advised that they are personally responsible for correctly submitting all assessment tasks and that failure to do so (e.g., by asking a friend to turn the assessment task in) may result in the assessment task being deemed not to have been submitted. Students must retain a hard copy of all assessment tasks submitted during the semester in case any problems arise. If students are to collect marked assessment tasks from some named location, the collection process must be monitored at all times by an appropriate member of staff; students must collect only their own work.

**7.1.7.2** When assessment tasks are marked and returned to students (except for formal final examinations), feedback to the student must be clear and readable and such feedback must be substantive and focused solely on the academic content of the task. Feedback comments of a derogatory nature shall not be made under any circumstances. All feedback must refer to specific content in the assessment task and be related to the marking criteria, not to personal characteristics of the student. In order for students to profit from feedback, it must be interpretable and meaningful in the context of learning what was successfully accomplished and how to do things better the next time rather than simply indicating that something was right or wrong.

### **7.1.8 External students**

**7.1.8.1** Clear and written documentation regarding all aspects of assessment relevant to the specific subject of study must be explicitly included in the Subject Notes, Study Guides or Resource Materials sent to all enrolled external students. Students must retain a hard copy of all assessment tasks submitted during the semester in case any problems arise.

**7.1.8.2** When assessment tasks are marked and returned to students (except for formal final examinations), feedback to the student must be clear and readable and such feedback must be

substantive and focused solely on the academic content of the task. Feedback comments of a derogatory nature shall not be made under any circumstances. All feedback must refer to specific content in the assessment task and be related to the marking criteria, not to personal characteristics of the student. In order for students to profit from feedback, it must be interpretable and meaningful in the context of learning what was successfully accomplished and how to do things better the next time rather than simply indicating that something was right or wrong.

## **7.2 Changes to assessment tasks**

Once the assessment requirements have been set down for a specific subject and distributed via subject materials, they may not be altered except in terms of varying due dates and other minor details. In the event of such minor modifications, all students must be informed, in writing, of the changes by the subject coordinator. Changes in the forms of assessment or in the number of assessment tasks will not be permitted once the semester has commenced, except under conditions approved by the Faculty-based Academic Review Committee.

## **8. Handling special assessment circumstances**

### **8.1 Special consideration, extensions, and deferred assessment**

Refer to Section 6.7.

### **8.2 Supplementary assessment**

There may be special circumstances, outside the provisions under Sections 6.7 where alternative arrangements must be made for assessment tasks for particular students. For example, special individual arrangements may need to be made for additional assessment tasks to be set for students who are unable, for legitimate reasons, to attend a compulsory residential school or for whom the carrying out of a specific assessment task, as originally set out, is not possible (as may be the case for people with visual impairment, unanticipated resource access problems or other difficulties). These special arrangements must be directly negotiated between the student and the subject coordinator with due consideration given to issues of equity and assessment validity. Whatever arrangements are agreed to must be set down in writing and signed by both parties, with a copy lodged in the relevant Faculty office. Supplementary assessment arrangements shall only be considered for students with genuine documented hardship claims; they will not be made simply to suit the student's convenience.

### **8.3 Re-marking and re-submission or previewing of student assessments**

#### **8.3.1 Re-marking of assessment tasks**

Students may request that an assessment task be re-marked, in its original form, in circumstances where the student presents a strong case arguing that the original marking was unfair or inconsistent with marking guidelines. This request must be directly addressed to the subject coordinator, with a copy to the Dean, by the student within 5 working days of receipt of the original marked assessment task. It will be the Dean's responsibility to arrange for the re-marking to be done. Only a single re-mark will be permitted, and the result of the re-mark will be recorded as the final mark for that assessment task, irrespective of its position relative to the original mark. If the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome, then normal University rules for handling appeals will be followed (Refer to General Rules for specific details).

#### **8.3.2 Assessment task re-submission and preview**

At the discretion of the subject coordinator, students may be invited or permitted to revise and re-submit a specific subject assessment task for marking. However, the maximum grade that can be attained for that assessment component under such circumstances is a grade of *Pass*.

Students shall also be advised that asking subject coordinators for preliminary reviews of any assessment tasks prior to formal submission is inappropriate and unfair to other students without that opportunity, unless the subject coordinator has clearly established, in writing, such a practice for all students enrolled in the subject.

### **8.4 Cheating and plagiarism**

Refer to the Policy on Plagiarism.

### **8.5 Examinations**

Refer to "Examination Rules" approved by the Academic Senate for specific details.

### **8.6 Re-sit Examinations**

Refer to "Examination Rules" approved by the Academic Senate for specific details.

## **9. Responsibilities**

### **9.1 Administration of Assessment**

- 9.1.1 Deans of Faculties have the general responsibility for the assessment process but will be advised by the Academic Review Committee of the Faculty.
- 9.1.2 Deans on the advice of the Academic Committee shall determine (i) the methods of assessment, and (ii) the standards of achievement required for the approved grades.
- 9.1.3 Mere attendance at prescribed classes shall not be a component of the assessment in any subject, but the Dean may prescribe that participation be a consideration for determining pass or fail. However, the Dean may prescribe that attendance at specified classes be a mandatory requirement for satisfactory completion of a subject and in such cases mechanisms must be in place to mark attendance properly.

### **9.2 Academic Review Committee**

Every Faculty should form an Academic Review Committee (ARC) to consider and re-consider issues related assessment, student progression, and other matters of an academic nature.

- 9.2.1 The Chairperson of the ARC shall be the Dean of the Faculty and comprises members of the Faculty either elected or nominated by the Dean. The committee shall comprise no less than five members or more than 15 members.
- 9.2.2 The ARC shall advise the Dean on the assessment used in the Faculty including all major components of assessment for each subject, particularly examination papers. The ARC is responsible for reviewing examination papers to determine suitability of the papers.
- 9.2.3 The ARC may exercise judgment by reviewing the results of assessment of each student and the grade distribution for each subject. Additionally, it may ensure that any modification or scaling of marks (as advised to students in the subject outline) has been applied systematically and consistently, and thus make certain that the marks presented for record keeping and declaration properly reflect the levels of performance of individual students.

### **9.3 Documentation of Assignment Receipt and Return**

Faculties must provide a system for recording the submission and return of work, to safeguard against claims of non-receipt and non-return.

## **9.4 Deans of Faculties**

Deans of Faculties must ensure that academic staff are familiar with relevant University regulations and policies, including this policy. Further, it is their responsibility to ensure that assessment methods and practices comply with University policies including the provisions of this Policy. All assessments must be carried out fairly, objectively and consistently for all students.

## **9.5 Academic Staff**

Guided by the Dean of the Faculty, the staff has the following responsibilities:

- 9.5.1** to identify the objectives of the subject clearly and in terms which enable students to understand what skills and knowledge they are expected to achieve, and what values and attitudes will be fostered by satisfactorily completing the subject; these objectives must be included in the Subject Outline;
- 9.5.2** to assess students' work fairly, objectively and consistently and to provide adequate feedback on performance. Such feedback should be appropriate, helpful and explanatory and should be delivered as promptly as possible on all work submitted for assessment.
- 9.5.3** to provide, where appropriate and possible, opportunities for students to participate in identifying their learning needs and planning their learning experiences and ways in which they will be assessed;
- 9.5.4** to inform students in writing by the end of the first week of formal contact for each subject, of the requirements for the subject including the method(s) of assessment to be used, or not later than the second week in cases where assessment methods and practices are to be finalized after consultation with the enrolled students. (Essential requirements are listed in the requirements for Subject Outline and on University Policy on Plagiarism);
- 9.5.5** to ensure that no change is made to assessment methods or weightings after the second week of session without the consent of every student enrolled in the subject. The subject co-ordinator must inform the Dean of the Faculty of any proposed changes and the way in which students are to be notified;
- 9.5.6** to notify the Dean as appropriate, of potential or actual conflicts of interest;
- 9.5.7** to maintain the confidentiality of personal information including marks;

**9.5.8** to attend meetings of the Academic Review Committee to advise the Dean on marks and grades;

**9.5.9** to ensure that all assessment work and other teaching commitments have been completed and that marks have been considered by the ARC before departing on leave. Another member of staff of the unit must be available to answer any subsequent enquiries about the subject.

## **9.6 Students**

Students have a responsibility to:

**9.6.1** comply with the requirements of assessment;

**9.6.2** submit for assessment their own individual and unassisted work, except as otherwise permitted;

**9.6.3** in general, respect the rights of other students and staff engaged in the teaching process; and

**9.6.4** comply with general rules for students.