



# ***Ahlia University Assessment Manual (version 4.0)***

***Ref: UC/P 232/ 2016***

***As approved by University Council Decision No. UC/1564/03/2016-17 of  
meeting No. UC/03/2016-17 held on Monday 28<sup>th</sup> November 2016.***

*This approved document is to be effective from second semester 2016-17 and it supersedes  
previous versions of the Assessment Manual and addendums thereof.*

**Ahlia University**  
**Assessment Manual**  
**(version 4.0)**

## Introduction

There are a number of reasons why students are assessed, for example: (1) improve student learning; (2) assessment level of learning; (3) provide confidence to stakeholders such as employers; (4) satisfy external accreditation requirements. In this regard the University requires that assessment should (1) be valid, reliable and fair; (2) be academically appropriate (3) measure performance against the intended learning outcomes; (4) provide students with feedback on learning (5) be moderated internally and externally.

The University has formal arrangements to ensure that learners are assessed and their learning achievements are recognized against agreed and published criteria, and that the regulations are applied fairly and consistently across the colleges. These arrangements are laid out in the following documents: Assessment Manual, Guidelines for the Undergraduate Project (XXXX499), and Guidelines for Good Practice in the Supervision of the Master's Degree Dissertation (XXXX595/599) and the Guidelines for Undergraduate Internship Programme (INTR400). These documents detail arrangements for the complete spectrum of assessment types embedded within undergraduate and Master's degree programmes at the University.

The University's Assessment Manual includes guiding principles, policies, procedures, processes, regulations and criteria for the design, conduct, marking, verification and moderation of formative and summative assessments as well as provision of feedback to students, release of grades and security of storage across all courses and programmes offered by the University.

# Assessment Design

## *Policy*

The University's assessment design policy and procedure provides a framework to ensure uniformity of the principles and methods by which assessments are prepared so that students are tested according to a recognized standard across all departments and colleges. The aim is to devise and utilize valid and reliable assessments that allow each student to demonstrate their level of achievement in regard to knowledge garnered, as well as understanding and skills through a variety of methods within each course. Overall, there must be a clear step-by-step development within courses (as detailed in the course syllabus), and year-on-year progression (as detailed in the programme specification), of academic achievement and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and attributes.

The following guiding principles are applicable to all courses:

1. Assessments are to be designed to ensure that students have the opportunity to develop the aptitudes for and to be assessed on, all the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) of the course. On each course syllabus / specification, ILOs are to be designated as either primary or secondary depending on course and programmatic objectives. Students must demonstrate a designated level of achievement on all primary ILOs in order to obtain credit for the course.
2. With respect to any course a valid assessment method measures most appropriately, achievement of the particular ILO. For example, in order to demonstrate acquisition of a clinical skill, the assessment method of choice would be demonstration of that skill and not a multiple choice question; however it may not always be so simple. A reliable assessment method would be expected to give the same results if repeated under the same conditions: for example, if two Assessors awarded the same grade for any one assignment of a student.
3. Course assessments must include *formative methods* for all primary ILOs so that students receive guidance on how to approach an assessed task and also feedback on their learning to aid further learning within a course (e.g. quizzes, tests and assignments), with that caveat that for each ILO addressed formatively, there must be at least one utilization of summative methods for those ILO. Summative methods provide evidence of achievement and to make decisions about progression or qualification with respect to the levels of learning (e.g. final examinations).

When designing a scheme of assessment, the aims and objectives of the course as well as the purpose of the assessment should be considered if it is to be effective. The choice of assessment task is also influenced by a number of important factors including but not limited to (1) appropriate and proportionate ILO-Assessment (2) Linkage and Weightage of the Course (3) benchmarks (4) Subject and discipline (5) professional frameworks where appropriate.

## ***Procedure***

- 1. Appropriate ILO-Assessment linkage:** University-wide ILOs for programmes and of all courses (theory, laboratory/practical, clinical, project/dissertation/internship) encompass development of: (A) knowledge and learning, (B) subject specific skills, (C) critical thinking skills and (D) general and transferrable skills; typically these are customized for each degree programme (see Appendix: *Generic ILO- Teaching/Learning-Assessment/NQF Linkage matrix*).<sup>1</sup>

The design team and course instructor/co-ordinator are required to refer to the University's generic template for linkage of (university wide) ILOs, teaching methods, assessment methods and NQF descriptors (see Appendix) when preparing the assessment scheme for programmes and courses. However the template is a basic guide and should not be considered exhaustive or limiting. The various assessment methods are defined in the Glossary (see Appendix).

- 2. Proportionate and Transparent ILO assessment:** The assessment scheme for a course should ensure that each and every ILO is transparently assessed and in a proportionate manner (i.e. the scheme should ensure that specific ILOs are not over assessed at the expense of others). Transparently assessed means that for each assessment question, marks associated with each ILO appertaining to that question are assigned so that the sum of these components equals the maximum marks awardable on the question.

The final exam should be comprehensive insofar as ~80% or more of the topics in the course, and the majority of ILO (except those which are not amenable to testing in this manner; see Appendix: *Generic ILO-Teaching/Learning-Assessment/NQF Linkage matrix*) should be assessed.

- 3. Designation of Primary and Secondary ILOs and Primary ILO-threshold floors as a check on final grade award: Final grades must be cross-referenced to achievement of primary ILOs such that:**

- For an award of A: performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 90%
- For an award of A-, performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 87%
- For an award of B+, performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 84%

- For an award of B, performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 80%
- For an award of B-, performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 77%
- For an award of C+, performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 74%
- For an award of C, performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 70%
- For an award of C-, performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 67%
- For an award of D+, performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 64%
- For an award of D, performance on all primary ILOs must be a minimum of 60%

If any primary ILO threshold grade is less than the composite grade award, the composite grade award must be reduced to reflect that lower threshold. In a course for which A1 and B1 are designated as primary ILOs, a student obtains a composite grade of 88.5 (A-) but achieved ILO scores on A1 and B1 are, respectively, 87.5 and 82.5. The result is that the final award is reduced to B.

Any student with a primary ILO score less than 60 get a final award of F regardless of that student's composite grade.

**4. Weightage of Assessments:** The assessment methods (e.g. course work and exams) and their respective weighting (so called 'components of assessment') are described in the course syllabus-specification and course specification and should be designed accordingly. The components of assessment are as follows:

- Course work (typically but not exclusively) made up of quizzes, tests and examinations), assignments (homework/in-class work), lab-based/clinical work/practical work, literature reviews/article critiques, case studies, non-research projects, research projects and oral participation/presentation<sup>2</sup>) but specifically excluding attendance is worth 40-60%. Of that content, the following guidelines appertain:
  - a) Research Projects (applicable to all colleges and all undergraduate programmes)
  - b) With respect to 200-level courses: 25% of courses at that level ought to have research projects with an average weightage of 10%;
  - c) With respect to 300-level courses: 50% of courses at that level ought to have research projects with an average weighting of 20%;
  - d) With respect to 400-level courses: 75% of of courses at that level ought to have research projects with an average weighting on 30%.
  - e) Gradually increasing the weightage of research as a course component is consonant with the objective of supporting and developing independent learning skills and responsibility for their own learning on the part of students on a progressive basis as students progress in the programme. *[in recognition that responsibility entails timeliness in terms of submission deadlines, the University employs a uniform university-wide set of penalty criteria*

*associated with late assignment submissions that apply not only to research projects in particular but also to assignments in general.]*

- f) In recognition of the importance of interactive participation in classroom activities, oral participation/oral presentation should be incorporated in 50% of all courses in all programmes in the College of Arts, Sciences and Education and in the College of Business and Finance in which, among those courses having an oral participation component, with respect to the final grade award schedule, should be 10% ( $\pm 5\%$ ). In the context of any summative assessments involving supervised group work, the latter, involving intra-group student discussions observed by the instructor, is also eligible to satisfy that threshold. Programmes in the Colleges of IT and Engineering, while exempt from these thresholds, ought to verify that oral presentation components are included though presentation of research and/or experimental (lab) findings.
- g) The final exam (which may be written, practical/clinical or a combination of these) is worth 40-60% of total marks for a course.

**Exceptions to the course work + final exam assessment approach are:**

- ☐ The undergraduate final year project and the Master's dissertation each of which are assessed by a written project/dissertation (worth 70% of total marks) and an oral presentation (worth 30%)
- ☐ The undergraduate internship which is assessed by the site supervisor (worth 50%), the academic supervisor (worth 10%), student bimonthly reports (worth 20%) and a final report (worth 20%).
- ☐ A course may be designed without a final exam if this is the norm for the course internationally and if certain University wide criteria have been satisfied and approved by the respective department, College and Curriculum Committee.

**4. Difficulty of assessment:** In addition to considering ILO-Assessment Linkage, it is important that consideration is given to the difficulty of the learning outcome when designing an assessment task or question. For example, with reference to the NQF level descriptors a learning outcome for analytical skills at level 7 would typically require *analysis, evaluation and/or synthesis of information and concepts within the common understanding*, whilst a level 9 learning outcome would typically require the *'use of a combination of approaches to critical analyse, evaluate or synthesize information that extends existing knowledge and concepts'*.

<sup>1</sup> It is the responsibility of the programme Design Team to determine the programme and/or course Intended learning Outcomes

<sup>2</sup> In the case of those courses that incorporate marks for class/oral participation, the University has provided a generic rubric which can be customized and applied according to the need of the course(s) concerned (see Appendix).

# Transparency of Assessment

## *Policy*

Ahlia University is committed to ensuring that the schedule, methods, marking criteria and guidelines of all assessments used during any course, to assess and evaluate the students' achievement of the course learning outcomes, are clearly defined and transparent to all students.

Under this policy, at the beginning of the semester students should be given a clear schedule of the course assessments together with information on the topics and ILOs covered by each assessment and the assessment and evaluation criteria and guidelines used in the course. During the semester, students should be given sufficient notice of these assessment criteria before submitting their work.

In order to ensure transparency of assessment, Ahlia University also requires that the criteria against which pieces of work are assessed (e.g. tests, quizzes, assignments, etc) are clearly documented (in the form of marking criteria or marking rubrics; and model answers should be provided where appropriate) and these should be available to students concerned as well as the internal and external verifier(s), internal moderation committee, and to the external assessor/examiner.

Ahlia University revision policy mandates that the last lecture of any course with a final examination be devoted to a comprehensive overview of the course as an aid to students in preparation of the final examination.

## *Procedure:*

1. The course instructor/co-ordinator must ensure that the course syllabus/specification ( which details the course aims, objectives, ILOs, teaching and assessment methods and schedule), is verified before the beginning of the course.
2. The course instructor should ensure that all assessment methods have clearly defined marking criteria with ILOs appertaining to each question, on any assessment, clearly identified with marks allocated to each ILO identified per question. Complex questions containing multiple components should be identified by means of submarks applicable to each component of the question. In addition: (i) solutions should be prepared for multiple choice questions or true/false type questions; (ii) model answers should be prepared for short answer type questions, essay questions, case studies and non-research-based projects; (iii)

university-wide marking rubrics should be employed to evaluate oral presentations/participation and research projects; (iv) there should be a cover sheet for the final examination which lists the questions.

3. The course instructor should ensure that the major piece of course work as well as the final exam is verified prior to being used for assessment.
4. The course instructor must ensure that the course syllabus/specification is distributed to all students during the first class of each course and that this document is also made available on the University E-Learning website (Moodle System).
5. During the first class or whenever any assessment is provided to students, the course instructor must explain (and where appropriate provide information sheets) on the following:
  - Question formats comprising the assessment including assessment criteria.
  - Details of how the assessment method relates to the learning outcomes developed through the course
  - The weighting of the assessment tasks and sub-tasks.
  - Marking rubrics for the evaluation of oral participation and research projects
  - The submission dates and methods of submission and collection
  - Whether the assessment is individual or team-based
  - In the case of team assessments, the responsibilities of each individual team member in completing each task and the degree of collaboration required
  - Expectations regarding word count or other length requirements.

# Security of Assessment Documents and Records

## *Policy*

The University recognises that the security and confidentiality of its paper-based assessments (whether they are course work or final exams) are of the utmost importance. For this reason, the question papers for all paper-based assessments should be dealt with, processed and stored in an environment that is b o t h restricted and secure.

Under this policy, it is the responsibility of the course instructor(s) or coordinator (for single-section and multi-section courses respectively) to:

- (1) Ensure security and confidentiality of all paper-based assessments during preparation, verification (where appropriate), storage, photocopying and distribution to students
- (2) Ensure security and confidentiality of student answer scripts during class tests and during the conduct of final exams, and in the marking and moderation processes
- (3) Ensuring that the sampling processes for moderation and for course files are carried out securely and according to the requirements of the university's quality assurance system.

In addition, it is mandatory to conduct verification and moderation within a secure area, typically the departmental office.

Finally, it is a University requirement that following completion of the moderation and marking processes, the answer scripts and course files should be stored securely for two years in the University's designated storage facility after which they must be disposed of appropriately. Arrangements are in place to collect and store the exam scripts in the custodial facility designated by the Chairperson and University. However, hard copies of Undergraduate projects and Master's dissertations must be securely stored in the department for as long as the degree programme is offered.

## ***Procedure:***

The following two procedures (for single-section and multi-section courses) set out the important steps and activities that should be implemented by instructors and coordinators to ensure complete security and confidentiality for paper-based assessments.

### **Single-section Courses**

The preparation, photocopying, storage and administration of all paper-based assessments are the sole responsibility of the course instructor. In addition, the instructor is charged with making copies of scripts of all major assessments (those contributing 20% or more to final course grade) of students.

1. The instructor must prepare paper-based assessments in strict security and confidentiality. For each course, as per HEC guidelines, the instructor must prepare two final examinations (the second being used as a fallback to the first should the instructor have reason to doubt the security and confidentiality of the first.)
2. For final exams, the instructor must personally give the assessment and its key solution to the internal verifier to be verified according to the Internal Verification Procedure. The verification must be done in a closed meeting with the instructor and in complete security and confidentiality. Subsequently, the instructor must make any necessary modifications to the final exam and/or its key solution, according to the suggestions of the verifier.
3. The instructor must make the required number of copies of the paper-based assessment, taking every care that no trace of the assessment is left behind. The copies of the assessment must be stored in the instructor's safe custody until the time of release to students.
4. The instructor must distribute the assessment question papers to students at the due time either directly or in collaboration with other invigilators.
5. On completion of the paper-based assessment, the instructor and/or other invigilator(s) must collect the answer scripts from students.
6. The students' scripts must be marked by the instructor in conditions of full and complete security and confidentiality.
7. After the marking process for continuous and final assessment, the instructor must keep sample copies of the answer scripts in the Course Files according to the requirements of the university's quality assurance system.
8. For paper-based assessments during continuous evaluation (e.g., tests/exams, quizzes, etc), course instructors must return marked answer scripts to students after evaluation and marking.

9. For final exams, three sample answer scripts must be selected for the Internal and External Moderation Procedures and these must also be handled in a way that preserves strict confidentiality and security.
10. After the moderation and marking processes are completed, the instructors must assure that all marked student scripts of final examinations (original copies) and/or of marked student scripts of major assessments (verified copies as the original, as per university guidelines, having been returned to students) are submitted to the chairperson of the concerned department.

### **Multi-section Courses**

In any multi-section course, the coordinator must make sure that all major paper-based assessments such as tests and exams are common for all sections. The preparation, photocopying, storage and administration of all common paper-based assessments in multi-section courses are the sole responsibility of the coordinator in coordination and collaboration with all instructors teaching the course. The course coordinator is charged with making copies of scripts of all major assessments (those contributing 20% or more to final course grade) of students.

1. The coordinator must prepare the paper-based assessment in coordination and collaboration with all instructors teaching the course and in strict security and confidentiality. For each course, as per HEC guidelines, the course coordinator, in collaboration with all the aforementioned instructors, must prepare two final examinations (the second being used as a fallback to the first should the coordinator have reason to doubt the security and confidentiality of the first.)
2. For final exams, the coordinator must personally give the assessment and its key solution to the internal verifier to be verified according to the Internal Verification Procedure. The verification must be done in a closed meeting with the coordinator and in complete security and confidentiality. Subsequently, the coordinator in consultation with other instructors must make any necessary modifications to the final exam and/or its key solution, according to the suggestions of the verifier.
3. The coordinator must make the required number of copies of the paper-based assessment, taking every care that no trace of the assessment is left behind. The copies of the assessment must be stored in the coordinator's safe custody until the time of release to the students.
4. The coordinator must distribute the assessment question papers to students at the due time in coordination and collaboration with other instructors of the course and with invigilators.

5. On completion of the paper-based assessment, the coordinator must collect the answer scripts from students in coordination and collaboration with other instructors of the course and any invigilators, whenever applicable.
6. The students' scripts from all sections must be marked by course instructors according to the University guidelines using team-based marking; specifically, the questions must be distributed among the instructors, each instructor marks few questions only but across all sections. This must be done in full and complete security and confidentiality.
7. After the marking process for continuous and final assessment, the coordinator must collaborate with other instructors to ensure that sample copies of the answer scripts are kept in the Course Files according to the requirements of the university's quality assurance system.
8. For paper-based assessments during continuous evaluation (e.g., tests/exams, quizzes, etc), the coordinator must collaborate with other instructors to ensure that marked answer scripts are returned to students after evaluation and marking.
9. For final exams, the coordinator must collaborate with other instructors to ensure that three sample answer student scripts are selected from each section to be used for the Internal and External Moderation Procedures and that these are also handled in a way that preserves strict confidentiality and security.
10. After the moderation and marking processes are completed, the instructors must return all of the marked student scripts of final examinations (original copies) and/or of marked student scripts of major assessments (verified copies as the original, as per university guidelines, have been returned to students) through the course coordinator to the chairperson of the concerned department.

## **CUSTODIAL STANDARDS AND SECURITY OF ASSESSMENT RECORDS**

1. Electronic records of *all* learner assessments (*irrespective* of whether the assessment is qualified as major or minor) are maintained and secured within the University's Admissions & Registrations System (ADREG). The regulations for data entry, extraction and security of records in ADREG are described in the *ADREG system user guidebook*. Final grades are entered by the course instructor after verification of final grades subsequent to examination administration. Grades of other assessments are entered within one month after the administration of the test or the receipt of the project or assignment from the student or on the prescribed date for entry of the final grade, whichever deadline comes sooner).

2. Chairpersons serve as the custodians of paper-based final examinations and *major* assessments. Final exam scripts are stored securely in the department (or other designated university storage facility under the “lock and key” of the relevant chairperson) for three years. Copies of major assessment scripts are stored securely in the department (or other designated university storage facility under the “lock and key” of the relevant chairperson) for two years.

## Marking of Assessments

### *Regulations*

The University requires that all student assessments within a course will be marked fairly and consistently, and with strict adhere to the marking criteria, as well as solutions, model answers or marking rubrics (as appropriate). Marking must be conducted in a secure environment in order to ensure the integrity of the assessments.

The physical process of marking student assessments for any one course is normally the responsibility of the course instructor (who may be assisted by a laboratory demonstrator or graduate teaching assistant, as appropriate), with reference to the marking criteria as well as solutions, model answers or rubrics as appropriate. In the case of multi-section courses each Instructor is assigned a part of the exam to mark for students across all sections and in this manner the marking is deemed to be fair and transparent (see UC/P13/201: Roles and Responsibilities of Coordinators of Multi-section Courses).

The exceptions to these marking regulations are:

1. The undergraduate final year research project (in which the oral exam and written report are marked by an examination committee consisting of the supervisor and two other internal examiners using university-wide criteria and rubrics, and the results averaged)
2. The Master’s dissertation (in which the oral exam and the dissertation are marked by an examination committee consisting of the supervisor, internal and external examiners using university-wide criteria and rubrics, and the results averaged)
3. The undergraduate internship (marked by the site supervisor and academic/internship supervisor and the results collated)
4. The marking of these exceptions are described in the respective guidelines: *Guidelines for the Undergraduate Project (XXXX499)*, and *Guidelines for Good Practice in the Supervision of the Master’s Degree Dissertation (XXXX595/599)* and the *Guidelines for Undergraduate Internship Programme (INTR400)*.

# Internal Verification and Moderation

## *Introduction*

This section explains the principles, policies and procedures for:

1. *Internal verification* of the course syllabus-specification and final examination for all taught courses at Ahlia University including XXXX499 and Master's dissertation.
2. *Internal moderation* of the marking for final examinations and the overall grade distribution for all taught courses (but excluding XXXX499 and Master's dissertation)

## *Guiding Principles*

1. Ahlia University aims to ensure that assessment of students is valid (or appropriate; i.e. measures what is supposed to measure), fair and meets the intended learning outcomes for each respective course by:
  - a. Promoting effective learning through *independent internal verification* of the course-syllabus specification, major piece of course work and final examination.
  - b. Utilize a process of internal moderation to ensure that the marking criteria as well as solutions, model answers or rubrics are fairly consistently applied in relation to the major piece of work and final examination.
2. The University has defined the policy and procedures for internal verification and moderation, and explained when these should be applied.
3. This policy should be considered a minimum level of acceptable practice for verification and moderation.

## ***Policy and Procedure: Internal Verification***

1. The course syllabus, major piece of course work and final examination for a respective course shall be subject to verification
2. The role of verification is to determine:
  - a. Validity of the assessment methods as regards the aims, objectives and intended learning outcomes for each respective course (as detailed in the Course Syllabus-Specification)
  - b. Whether or not the assessment scheme for each course is fair and effective
  - c. Validity of the final examination vis-à-vis the course intended learning outcomes
3. Internal verification is to be undertaken by a minimum of one faculty member (the 'verifier'), who is not an instructor of the respective course but who teaches in, or is well acquainted with, the subject area (and selected the Chairperson).
4. The Course Instructor should provide the verifier with:
  - a. Course Syllabus-Specification (including tentative dates for each assessment)
  - b. Major piece of course work and marking criteria as well as solutions, model answers or rubrics, as appropriate
  - c. Final examination script and marking criteria as well as solutions, model answers or rubrics, as appropriate
5. The verification process for the Course Syllabus-Specification, major piece of course work and final examination consists of answering a number of questions (and providing constructive remarks where appropriate) which must be recorded on the appropriate forms (see below), and thereafter the verifier discusses this feedback with the Instructor concerned and any changes are made accordingly.
  - a. *Internal Verification of the Course Syllabus-Specification*
  - b. *Internal Verification of the major piece of course work*
  - c. *Internal Verification of the Final Exam.*
6. The completed forms, original and the final versions of the course syllabus-specification, major piece of course work or final exam are forwarded to the Chairperson for review as well as secure storage in the department office.

***Process: Internal verification of course specification or syllabus/specification***

1. The Chairperson of the Department nominates a verifier for each course two weeks before commencement of the semester. It is at the discretion of each Department/College to decide how many verifiers are required for all the courses in the degree programme concerned.
2. The Instructor<sup>3</sup> or the Coordinator of multi-section course meets the respective verifier and hands-over the syllabus/specification to her/him as early as possible, and no later than one week before the commencement of the semester.
3. The Verifier verifies the syllabus/specification and completes the form: *Internal Verification of Course syllabus/specification*. Thereafter the Verifier discusses this feedback with the Instructor concerned and any changes are made accordingly, prior to distributing the course syllabus-specification to students.
4. The completed form, original and the final version of the assessment are forwarded to the Chairperson/ Director of the MBA for record keeping, and for completion of the form:

*Internal Verification and Moderation Summary Report* which should then be forwarded to the College Dean for monitoring of the process and for him/her to provide critical feedback to the Assessment Committee.

***Process: Verification of the major piece of course work and final Examination paper***

1. Normally, the Verifier is the same person responsible for checking the course specification and syllabi/specifications prior to the start of the semester.
2. The Instructor provides the Verifier with the major piece of course work and final examination paper as well as the marking criteria and solutions, model answers or rubric and model answers as appropriate, at least two weeks before these assessments are conducted.

---

<sup>3</sup> In the case of multi-section courses, the Coordinator finalizes the course syllabus/specifications with all the Instructors of the course, and then provides the Verifier with the documents.

3. The verifier records his/her findings in the appropriate forms (i.e. *Internal verification of the major piece of course work* or *Internal verification of Final Examination* and returns these to the Instructor.
4. The Instructor makes any recommended changes to the documents before conducting the assessments.
5. The Verifier submits the completed form, original and the final version of the assessment to the Chairperson/ Director of the MBA for secure record keeping, and for completion of the form: *Internal Verification and Moderation Summary Report*.
6. The *Internal Verification and Moderation Summary Report* should then be forwarded to the College Dean for monitoring of the process and for him/her to provide critical feedback to the Assessment Committee.

A guide to timelines for the above processes is provided in Table 1

## ***Policy and Procedure: Internal Moderation***

1. The moderation will be conducted by the *Internal Moderation Committee* which normally consists of the concerned Course Instructor/Coordinator (in the case of multi-section courses), the Chairperson of the Department (or Director of the MBA), and one other faculty member.
2. All courses will have their major piece of course work, final examinations and overall grade distribution internally moderated
3. As a minimum requirement, moderation should consist of:
  - a. A review of the major piece of course work with the highest, average and lowest marks (i.e. one or two from each category) to ensure that the assessment criteria have been correctly and accurately applied.
  - b. A review of final exam scripts with the highest, average and lowest marks (i.e. one or two from each category) to ensure that the assessment criteria have been correctly and accurately applied.
  - c. A review of the major piece of course work and final exam scripts for borderline-fail students
  - d. Confirmation that the overall class marks are near normally distributed (for a size of  $\geq 20$  students). The University accepts that not all groups of students within a class are homogenous. In a case where there is not a normal distribution of grades, the instructor can align the grade justification with the capabilities of the students and their overall performance during the semester.
  - e. Confirmation that the average class marks are within the norms for the level of the course within the College and the University as a whole
4. Details of the moderation should be recorded on the form: *Internal Moderation of the major piece of course work and Final Examination and Overall Grade Distribution* and any recommendations implemented by the Instructor.
5. The completed forms and the final grade distribution are forwarded to the Chairperson/Director of the MBA.

### ***Process : Internal Moderation***

1. The Chairperson (or Director of the MBA) forms the *Internal Moderation Committee* which normally consists of the concerned Course Instructor/Coordinator (in the case of multi-section courses), the Chairperson/Director of the MBA.
2. The Chairperson/Director of the MBA prepares the schedule of Meetings for moderation of each course giving two days for evaluation of the major piece of course work and the final exam scripts by the Instructor(s) after the final examination of the course..
3. Using the form: *Internal Moderation of the major piece of course work and Final Examination and Overall Grade Distribution*, the Internal Moderation Committee reviews the students' major piece of course work and the final exam scripts (one or two of the highest, the average and the lowest marks) against the marking criteria and solutions, model answers or rubric as appropriate, and the Grade sheet submitted by the Instructor/Coordinator.
4. The Instructor/Coordinator implements any recommendations from the committee and finalizes the students' grades accordingly.
5. The completed form must be retained by the Chairperson (or Director of the MBA) for record-keeping, and for completion of the form *Internal Verification and Moderation Summary Report* which should then be forwarded to the College Dean for monitoring of the process and for him/her to provide critical feedback to the Assessment Committee.

A guide to timelines for the above processes is provided in Table1.

**Table 1. A guide to timelines for Internal Verification and Moderation**

	Description	Responsible person(s)	Proposed Time period
1.	Nomination of Verifier(s)	Chairperson/ Director MBA	Before commencement of the Semester
2.	Internal Verification of Course specifications and Course Syllabi/specifications for each course	Course Instructor + Verifier	Before the Semester begins
3.	Internal verification of: <input type="checkbox"/> The major piece of course work as well as the marking criteria and solutions, model answers or marking rubric as appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> The Final Examination question Paper as well as the marking criteria and solutions, model answers or marking rubric as appropriate		Two weeks before the assessment is distributed to students
4.	Communication of the Schedule for moderation to all faculty members by the Chairperson/MBA Committee	Chairperson/ Director MBA	Before commencement of the final examinations
5.	Internal moderation of sample student exam scripts (highest, average, lowest) and the final Grades	Internal moderation Committee	Before uploading of Grades by the Instructor

## **External verification and moderation**

### ***Introduction***

The University recognizes the importance of the External Assessor/Examiner in validating the performance of the internal verification and moderation systems as well as providing feedback on the overall standard of each course within a particular degree programme. This section explains the principles, policies and procedures for *External Assessment* of all courses (except the Master's project/dissertation) .

### ***Policy on the Application of External Moderation and Verification***

The University's assessment system is designed to demonstrate confidence in academic standards by adopting the use of independent and external Assessor/Examiners, for review of the (i) the course syllabus; (ii) the major piece of course work and the related marking criteria, solutions, model answers or rubric, (iii) samples of students' major piece of course work and the final examination scripts; (iv) grade distribution for a course and the overall standard of the course concerned, and this must be completed before the release of the final grades to students (so that recommended grade changes can be applied if deemed appropriate and necessary). The external verification and moderation processes are designed so that, in the course of a three-year LPRS cycle, all non-service courses applicable to the programme specialization, are covered. Such implies that in each academic year 33 1/3% of the courses in a degree programme are moderated and verified. The owner of this process is the chairperson charged with running the programme in coordination with the departmental council. For service courses, the rate of annual review is identical but the owner of the process is the dean of the college from which the course is housed.

### ***Procedure for the Application of External Moderation and Verification***

In prioritizing courses for external moderation and verification, with respect to non-service courses, all scores derived from the course contents portion of the Instructor and Course Evaluation are ranked in descending order (lowest first / highest last). The lowest sixth are identified in the first term of the cycle with the caveat that there should at least be one course at each level: 100, 200, 300 and 400. In the next term, the next lowest sixth is identified subject to the same multiple level constraint and proceeding likewise until all courses have been moderated and verified externally. For that purpose, summer term is excluded. For service courses, the order of moderation and verification is solely derived from descending order ranking.

## ***Policy for Nomination of External Assessor/Examiner***

### **Inclusion criteria**

External Assessor/Examiners are appointed from outside of the University if they show appropriate evidence (by means of a short curriculum vitae), of satisfying the following criteria:

1. A Ph.D. qualification in the field of the program and/or extensive academic experience where appropriate.
2. Competence and experience in the fields, covered by the concerned programme.
3. Fluency in the language instruction of the degree programme.
4. Awareness of standards and current developments in the design and delivery of related curricula.
5. Competency and experience relating to design and implementation of student assessment methods appropriate to the subject.
6. Respect of professional peers due to sufficiency of standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the field.

### **Exclusion criteria:**

1. A member of a governing body, advisory board or committee of the University
2. A graduate student, a current or a former faculty member of the University who served at the university during the last four years.
3. A job applicant to Ahlia University in the year of the evaluation or in the following three years.
4. The external Assessor/Examiner should not have been previously been appointed Assessor/Examiner within the last two years at Ahlia University.
5. Any person with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved in the degree programme
6. Any person who is, or who has been significantly involved in collaborative research activities with a faculty member involved in the delivery of the degree programme or its courses within the last three years.
7. Reciprocal arrangements involving similar programmes at another University.

8. Appointment of an external Assessor/Examiner from the department/Institution of a current/previous Assessor/Examiner.

It is at the discretion of the College concerned to decide whether or not the same Assessor/Examiner is suitable to provide feedback on more than one degree programme within the College.

### ***Procedure for Nominating, Approving and Inviting the External Assessor/Examiner***

1. The College Council nominates (or selects) up to three External Assessor/Examiners according to the criteria stated above and completes the form: *Nomination of External Assessor/Examiner Form*. In the case of the MBA Programme the nomination is made initially by the MBA Committee and then forwarded to the College Council for approval.
2. If the programme is at postgraduate level then approval must be sought from the Graduate Studies & Research Council.
3. Finally the nominations are forwarded to the University Council for approval. If all nominations are approved then the Chairperson/MBA Committee can select any of the nominees based on their availability.
4. On approval of the nomination, an invitation and agreement letter will be forwarded from the Chairperson of the concerned programme, to the proposed Assessor/Examiner.
5. The duration of appointment will normally be two years.
6. The External Assessment process begins once the nominee has agreed to participate.

## ***Procedures and Process: External assessment***

### ***1. Role of the Chairperson/ Director of MBA Committee***

- 1.1. The Chairperson/Director of the programme shall initiate the External Verification and Moderation process by preparing a Schedule in consultation with the External Assessor/Examiner (see Table 2 below).
- 1.2. The Chairperson/Director shall arrange for the External Assessor/Examiner to visit the University and undertake the verification and moderation process on University premises. If the External Assessor/Examiner is unable to attend, the Chairperson will consult the Vice President (Academic Affairs) who will confirm the process to be followed.
- 1.3. At the meeting on University premises convened for this purpose, the Chairperson shall provide the External Assessor/Examiner with the following documents:
  - i) Written confirmation of his/her appointment and the Schedule of meetings
  - ii) Hard/e-copy of the current University Catalogue
  - iii) The University Assessment Manual
  - iv) The programme specifications, course specification, syllabus/specification
  - v) Major piece of course work, final examination paper and marking criteria, as well as solutions, model answers or rubrics as appropriate
  - vii) The External Assessor/Examiner Forms E1 and E2
  - vi) Students' final exam scripts for courses offered in the Semester
- 1.3 The Chairperson/Director shall ensure that Forms E1 and E2 duly signed by the External Assessor/Examiner after completion of the Process are utilised in the grade confirmation meeting (see 1.4) and retained in line with university requirements.
- 1.4 The Chairperson/Director shall convene a meeting of the Departmental Council to consider reports from the Internal Moderation Committee and from External Assessor/Examiners, make any grade adjustments and confirm final grades, **before** marks/grades are released.

### ***2. Role of External Assessor/Examiner***

- 2.1. The External Assessor/Examiner shall attend the University to carry out his/her Verification/Moderation duties.

2.2. At the meeting on University premises convened for this purpose, the External Assessor/Examiner shall

- i) carry out the verification process in line with the framework stated in Form E1 and complete Form E1 including remarks and comments on the overall process.
- ii) carry out the moderation process for a sample of answer scripts in line with the framework stated in Form E2 and complete Form E2 including any recommendations for grade change.

2.3 The External Assessor/Examiner shall submit Forms E1 and E2 to the Chairperson/Director of the Programme immediately after the verification/moderation process is completed.

### ***3. Schedule for the External Verification/Moderation Process***

Table 2 below shows the time period in which the External Verification and Moderation process shall be completed. **Table 2. Guide to Timelines for External Verification/Moderation**

No	Description	Responsible person(s)	Time period
1.	Initiate dialogue with the External Assessor/Examiner and agree the schedule for External Assessment	Chairperson/ Director	Two weeks before the beginning of semester final examinations
2.	Notify the External Assessor/Examiner of arrangements for the Verification/Moderation Meeting at the University and provide appropriate documents from the list in section 1.3	Chairperson/ Director	As soon as Internal Moderation is complete for 25% of the Programme courses
3.	Attend the Verification/Moderation Meeting at the University, carry out the Verification/Moderation process and submit completed Forms to the Chairperson/Director of the Programme	External/ Assessor/Examiner Chairperson/Director	Within 72 hours after notification by the Chairperson/ Director
4.	Convene Department Council meeting to discuss reports by External Assessor/Examiner Internal Moderation Committees and approve the final grades	Department Council	Within one day after the External Assessor/Examiner reports are received
5.	Convene MBA Committee meeting to endorse final grades after meeting of Department Council*	Department Council/MBA Committee	Within one day after the Department Council meeting
6.	Upload final grades into ADREG system	Instructors	Within one day after the Department Council meeting
7.	Verify final grades in ADREG system and authorize release to students	Chairperson/ Director	Within one day after the Department Council meeting
8.	Submit to Dean of College the minutes of the Departmental Council meeting and summary of programme results	Chairperson/ Director	In line with College Council meeting timetable

\*Step 5 only applies to the MBA programme and the courses therein.

# Approval of Assessment Results

## *Policy*

In line with its mission to achieve quality, fairness and transparency in education provision, the University is committed to ensuring that student certification results/grades are verified, moderated and approved efficiently, consistently and fairly. Assessment of students must strictly be guided by the Ahlia University Assessment Manual which requires that student assessments and results go through processes for internal and external verification as well as internal and external moderation to ensure appropriateness for the course level and fairness to students.

It is the policy of the University that students should not have access to their final grades until the due processes of verification, moderation and approval of results have been followed, as laid down by the University's procedures and processes. This policy applies consistently to all undergraduate and graduate programs offered by the University.

## *Procedure*

The following procedure must be applied across all university programs and by all departments to approve students' assessment results and grades by the end of each semester.

1. The students' final marks (out of 100 marks) must be finalized by the instructor after adding the final examination marks to the total mark of the course continuous evaluation (such as quizzes, tests, assignments, etc) obtained during the course. The instructor must assign final grades to the students according to the University's grading system. The instructor must then submit the detailed mark-sheets (with final grades) and the assessed/marked final examination answer scripts to the chairperson of the department within 72 hours after the final examination.
2. In the case of a multi-section course, the coordinator must coordinate the evaluation/marketing of final examination scripts and the finalization of grades according to the University Policy on and Procedure for Multi-Section Courses. The coordinator must submit the detailed mark- sheets (with final grades) and the assessed/marked final examination answer scripts of all sections to the chairperson.

3. The Internal Moderation Committee for the course, which consists of at least three members including the Chairperson of the Department (in the chair) and the instructor/coordinator of the course, must meet within one day of the submission of the final marks and grades sheet to examine student marks and grades and to verify the marking/evaluation of final exams according to the guidelines of the Internal Moderation Procedure stated in Ahlia University Assessment Manual.
4. After receiving the reports of the Internal Moderation Committees of at least 25 percent of the offered courses, the Chairperson must initiate the external moderation process according to the University Assessment Manual, which must be completed within 72 hours.
5. On completion of the internal and external moderation processes, the Department Council must meet to consider the moderation reports and to approve the finalised grades of students in all departmental courses
6. If the department offers any course to the MBA Program, the approved grades of these courses must be submitted to the Director of the MBA for endorsement by the MBA Committee and thereafter the grades of these courses are treated just like other courses.
7. Immediately following the Department Council meeting, course instructors must upload the approved grades into the University ADREG system as per the Grade Entry Procedure of the University.
8. Following grade entry, the Chairperson must verify the grades in the system by comparing them with the results approved by the Departmental Council and authorise the grades to be made accessible to students in the ADREG system.
9. The Chairperson must submit to the Dean of the College the minutes of the departmental meeting(s) in which the grades were approved and a summary of the program results. In the case of the MBA Program, the Program Director must submit a summary report of the program's grades to the Dean of the College of Business and Finance.
10. The Dean must present the results of all programs within the college to the College Council for information.

# Feedback on the Student Assessments

## *Policy*

The University considers the feedback given to the students regarding their performance in the course assessments as a crucial and integral part of the learning process. Students should obtain regular and constructive feedback on their academic performance and attainment of the course learning outcomes. Regular, informative and constructive feedback enables students to monitor their progress, make sensible judgments regarding their learning achievements (knowledge and skills gained) and determine areas of improvements; it also encourages them to enhance their performance in subsequent learning activities.

For these reasons, course assessments should be appropriately spaced across the semester to facilitate the provision of feedback to students at various stages during the learning process. In particular, feedback should be given to the students regarding their performance on the previous assessment and before the next assessment method is due. It is also important that students receive informative and constructive feedback on their academic performance on all assessments taken during the study period before the final examination.

## *Procedure:*

1. Before the beginning of each semester, course instructors must carefully review the course syllabi/specifications to ensure that the course assessment methods are appropriately spaced across the semester to facilitate the provision of feedback to students at various stages during the learning process. In addition, the course syllabus/specification is verified by an internal verifier as per the University Internal Verification Procedure.
2. Course instructors must ensure that they provide regular feedback regarding assessment to students using the appropriate method
  - ☐ Oral feedback on formative and summative assessments given in class: this may be by instructors or by peers and may relate to presentations, participation in discussions and group debates and may be to individual students or to the class as a whole. Oral feedback is compulsory on a major assessment (weighted 20% or more of the course grade).
  - ☐ Oral feedback through direct face-to-face contact with individual students during discussion in office hours. Oral feedback during office hours is compulsory only with students who are deemed “in-need;” meaning those who have attained a grade of C- or lower on a major assessment and a record of that meeting should be recorded and sent to

the Student's Academic advisor. Students who miss the oral feedback session under these circumstances are to be reported to the student's academic advisor and the Dean of Student's for follow-up.

- ☐ Written feedback and comments on assessment papers which are returned to students on completion of the marking and evaluation process. Written feedback, at a minimum, ought to include corrections of all incorrect or incomplete answers written in the assessment.
  - ☐ Written feedback through provision of key assessments solutions on major assessments. Key solutions may be presented in class or be made available to students in the appropriate format (hard or soft copy through Moodle system) after completion of each assessment (except the final examination).
  - ☐ Feedback given through Moodle interactive tools which allow communication with students.
3. Course instructors must ensure that they return student scripts and provide feedback on major assessments to students within seven working days (on minor assessments three working days) after the assessment with major assessments carrying a minimum weightage of 20% of the course grade. For research projects imbedded in courses at the 200-, 300 and especially 400-level, course instructors have 14 days to do the same in recognition of the burden of providing feedback on a wide variety of academic content on an individual basis.
  4. Course instructors must ensure that all paper-based assessments (except for the final examination) are returned to students on completion of the marking process. In keeping with security of records, however, the instructors ought to photocopy all scripts that relate to major pieces of work (assessments bearing a weightage of 20% or more of course grade). In addition, the instructors must keep sample copies of assessed work according to the requirements of the University quality assurance system.
  5. In addition it is required that course instructors provide students with their total marks for course work (Continuous evaluation marks) prior to attending the final examination. Students are encouraged to seek feedback from the course instructor, and it is expected that this feedback must relate to the assessment criteria as discussed above

## **Student challenge of grade**

### ***Policy***

It is the policy of Ahlia University to ensure that all students have access to a fair mechanism through which they can address their concerns regarding course performance as efficiently as possible. To ensure that such concerns are dealt with swiftly, the University ensures that every student has the right to challenge the results of any major assessment in addition to the final course grade. For the purposes of challenge of grade, a major assessment is considered to be 20% or more of the final course grade.

The deadline for challenging the results of a major assessment is one month from the receipt of the assessment script by the student. In no case, however, will a challenge of a major assessment be entertained if the final grade for the course has already been entered. At that stage, the student's only recourse is to challenge the final course grade.

The deadline for challenging a grade is defined as the end of the semester after the grade was awarded and for purposes of this deadline, the summer session does not count. In order to ensure an objective investigation, any Challenge of Grade will be investigated by an ad-hoc committee constituted by the Dean of the relevant College, which will consist of three faculty members and which may include the instructor of the course. The student may appeal against the decision by following the University Appeal Procedure.

In addition, a student can challenge a grade not on the merits but on the basis of a mitigating circumstance that rendered the student at a disadvantage in undertaking the assessment. The challenge may be with respect to a major assessment or with a final grade but, in the event that the challenge is with respect to a major assessment, the major assessment should be a test with a weightage no less than 20% of the final course grade. (for assignments, the appropriate remedy is for the instructor to provide an extension of the deadline for submission proportionate to the circumstance besetting the student.)

### ***Procedure for Appeal against the Result of a Major Assessment not based on a Mitigating Circumstance***

1. The student must submit a completed Challenge of Result of a Major Assessment Form to the Directorate of Admission and Registration and pay any stipulated

fees – this date is the start of the process.

2. Directorate of Admission and Registration must forward the Challenge of Result of a Major Assessment Form to the Dean of the relevant college.
3. The College Dean, in coordination with the relevant department, must appoint an ad hoc Challenge of Grade Committee consisting of three faculty members who may include the instructor of the course to review the challenged grade.
4. The Challenge of Grade Committee must review the student's answers and the marking of the assessment based on the key solution or the marking rubrics provided by the instructor.
5. The committee must make a decision to raise the grade, lower the grade or keep the student grade unchanged, based on the evidence and information obtained during the review.
6. The committee must submit a summary report including its final decision to the Dean of the college within one month of the date that the student submitted the Challenge of Result of a Major Assessment Form.
7. The result of the Challenge of Result of a Major Assessment Grade must be entered in ADREG system and the student's record must be updated by the Dean in collaboration with the relevant chairperson.
8. The Dean must inform the student about the committee's final decision

### ***Procedure for Appeal of Final Grade Award not based on a Mitigating Circumstance***

1. The student must submit a completed Challenge of Final Grade Award Form to the Directorate of Admission and Registration and pay any stipulated fees – this date is the start of the process.
2. Directorate of Admission and Registration must forward the Challenge of Final Grade Award Form to the Dean of the relevant college.
3. The College Dean, in coordination with the relevant department, must appoint an ad hoc Challenge of Final Grade Award Committee consisting of three faculty members who may include the instructor of the course to review the challenged grade.
4. The Challenge of Final Grade Award Committee must review the student's answers and the marking of the final exam based on the key solution or the marking rubrics provided by the instructor.

5. The committee must make a decision to raise the grade, lower the grade or keep the student grade unchanged, based on the evidence and information obtained during the review.
6. The committee must submit a summary report including its final decision to the Dean of the college within one month of the date that the student submitted the Challenge of Final Grade Award Form.
7. The result of the Challenge of Final Grade Award must be entered in ADREG system and the student's record must be updated by the Dean in collaboration with the relevant chairperson.
8. The Dean must inform the student about the committee's final decision

***Procedure for Appeal of a Major Assessment or Final Grade based on a Mitigating Circumstance***

1. The student must submit a completed Challenge of Grade based on Mitigating Circumstance Form to the Directorate of Admission and Registration and pay any stipulated fees – this date is the start of the process.
2. Directorate of Admission and Registration must forward the Challenge of Grade based on Mitigating Circumstance Form to the Dean of the relevant college.
3. The College Dean, in coordination with the relevant department, must appoint an ad hoc Challenge of Grade based on Mitigating Circumstance Committee consisting of three faculty members, including the Dean himself or herself (or a delegate thereof from the Deanship of Student Affairs appointed by himself/herself) plus the Student Counselor and the student's Academic Advisor.
4. The Challenge of Grade based on Mitigating Circumstance Committee must review the student's answers and the marking of the relevant assessment based on the key solution or the marking rubrics provided by the instructor in light of the gravity of the mitigating circumstance(s) asking themselves to what extent would the performance of an average person on the assessment have been adversely impacted by the circumstance(s) described by the student after the veracity of the alleged circumstances has been ascertained through investigation by the Committee
5. The committee must make a decision to raise the grade, lower the grade or keep the student grade unchanged, based on the evidence and information obtained during

the review. The Committee may also recommend that the student be afforded the opportunity to sit a make-up assessment in lieu of the previous assessment. A decision to keep the grade the same or lower the grade may be made with or without prejudice: without prejudice means that the veracity of the student's account is not denied but that the Committee finds no basis for mitigation but with prejudice means that the Committee finds the student's account to be spurious or mendacious, in which case the Committee must refer the matter to the Discipline Committee for action to be taken against the student.

6. The committee must submit a summary report including its final decision to the Dean of the college within one month of the date that the student submitted the Challenge of Grade based on Mitigating Circumstance Form.
7. The result of the Challenge of Grade based on Mitigating Circumstance must be entered in ADREG system and the student's record must be updated by the Dean in collaboration with the relevant chairperson.
8. The Dean must inform the student about the committee's final decision

# Student Assessment Appeals

## *Policy*

It is the policy of Ahlia University to ensure that all students have access to a fair and efficient mechanism through which they can address their concerns regarding course performance. The Challenge of Grade Procedure is the first stage in addressing such concerns and the Student Assessment Appeals policy and associated procedure provide a clear approach for handling appeals against decisions made in that Procedure. Appeals may be made either with respect to the outcome of the Challenge of Result of a Major Assessment or the Challenge of Final Grade Award. For both, the process is identical.

The deadline for such appeals is no later than 30 days from the day in which the student was notified of the decision and for purposes of this deadline the summer session does not count, so that appeal against decisions made at the end of the second semester or during the summer session may be submitted within 30 days of the beginning of the first semester. It is the sole responsibility of the student to state clearly the reasons for his/her appeal and to ensure that the appeal is submitted by the deadline.

Student appeals will be investigated thoroughly by the University *Student Appeals Committee* (SAC) which is a standing committee of the University and consists of the following members

1. Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA; Chairperson)
2. The Dean of Student Affairs
3. Three faculty members appointed by the Chair to meet the requirements that they
  - Are not from the college which offers the course and which is the subject of the appeal
  - Have not advised or assisted the student with the appeal
  - Have no conflict of interest with regard to the student, the course or the college
4. A student representative appointed by the Dean of Student Affairs.

As part of its commitment to fair and transparent assessment, this policy requires that the investigation and decision made by SAC is governed by the following principles:

- The investigation should be based on mutual respect and procedural fairness for all students, faculty members and any others who may be involved.
- The committee should conduct its meetings or hearings in closed sessions and treat the appeal in strict confidentiality.

- The committee should investigate the matter on the basis of all evidence presented and obtained by the student and/or the University;
- The committee's investigation may require inspecting other documentation related to the appeal and conducting interviews with students, faculty and staff. In particular, the committee may decide to review some or all of the assessments taken by the student.
- The committee should investigate whether the university policies, processes, procedures, regulations and guidelines were implemented correctly;
- The committee should give the student a reasonable opportunity to make a case in either writing or orally in person through for example special briefings or meetings.
- The committee may allow the student to see or inspect some or all of the related documentations;
- The committee should deal with the appeal as efficiently and as fairly as possible;
- The committee's decision should be evidence-based, transparent and made within at most one month from the time of the initiation of the appeal.
- The decision made by the committee is final and binding.

### ***Procedure***

1. The student must submit a completed Appeal Form to the Office of the Deanship of Students Affairs and pay any required fees – this date is the start of the process.
2. The Appeal Form must be forwarded to the Chairperson of the Student Appeals Committee (SAC).
3. The Chairperson of SAC checks that the Appeal Form meets the requirement for statement of reasons and for timely submission. If it does, the Chairperson must appoint three faculty members to SAC according to the criteria stated in the University Policy on Students Assessment Appeals and request the Dean of Students Affairs to nominate the student representative.
4. Once members are appointed, the Chairperson convenes the SAC meeting to consider the appeal and start the investigation. SAC may inspect other related documents and conduct briefings and interviews with students, faculty and staff. In particular, SAC may decide to review some or all of the assessments taken by the student.
5. The SAC must make a clear decision, which will final and binding, and will be either to dismiss the appeal or to uphold the appeal and make a change to the grade.
6. The SAC Chairperson must enter a summarized report of its findings and decision in the ADREG System and notify the Deanship of Students Affairs that the student and

the relevant College/Department may be informed.

7. The office of the Deanship of Students Affairs must notify the student of the outcome and also notify the College/Department the result of the appeal for implementation of any necessary modifications or actions.

## **Academic misconduct**

### ***Policy***

High ethical and moral standards as well as academic integrity are core values of the University. In a small number of cases there are students who are tempted to gain an unfair advantage in their assessments. This behaviour is considered unacceptable. There are at least three types of academic misconduct, which Ahlia University acknowledges and wishes to prevent: (1) plagiarism; (2) collusion; and (3) personation.

1. **Plagiarism** includes the practice of presenting ideas, words, data, diagrams, illustrations or other output as original pieces of work or without proper acknowledgment (including appropriate identification and referencing) of the source.
2. **Collusion** is an act, involving two or more students, to deceive or mislead the University by submitting identical assignments or other pieces of work and presenting it as individual efforts.
3. **Personation** consists of one or more individuals preparing assignments for another student, or taking the place of another student in an examination.

The University acknowledges its role in the development of the students including academic integrity and in this regard the University is committed to providing on-going education to students regarding the importance of academic integrity and at the same time enforcing a zero tolerance policy towards such behaviour. The regulations related to academic misconduct including application of fair and proportionate penalties - have been developed from those at the University of Bahrain as per the requirements of the HEC.

### ***Procedures***

1. High ethical and moral standards as well as academic integrity are core values of the University and communicated to students, along with the consequences of infringement(s), by means of University-wide, and College Induction programmes.
2. Academic integrity and ethics in research are covered in the syllabi of the ethics and the research methods courses which are mandatory for all degree programmes.

3. The University has formal and transparent procedures for reporting and managing cases of plagiarism and academic misconduct and these are provided to students in Guidelines for the Undergraduate Project (XXXX499), and Guidelines for Good Practice in the Supervision of the Master's Degree Dissertation (XXXX595/599), the Invigilation and Final Examination Administration Regulations as well as the Student Guide all of which are available on the University website. In this regard the students are provided with specific details about what is/are considered unacceptable practise(s).

### ***Processes for Deterrence of Academic Misconduct***

#### **a. With respect to non-test/exam based assessments**

Latest versions of all textbooks should be used. Answers to questions can be downloaded using “cheatware” on a fee basis. The longer the question is in the market, the greater the risk that the question has been compromised by “cheatware.”

As a matter of good practice, any questions appearing at the end of chapters should be modified to frustrate the downloading of answers using “cheatware” especially, in those limited cases, when the latest textbook version is not being used. In the employment of cases, instructors, as a matter of best practice, ought to recognize that the answers may likewise be compromised and ought to formulate new questions to frustrate students tapping into answers through “cheatware.”

#### **b. With respect to in-class tests**

Best practice mandates that instructors use multiple test versions to deter copying with minor changes in the content of questions to render difficult ability of students to identify the test version they have. Alternately, tests can be broken down into separate test components with different components being distributed in phases. Thus a three- question test with questions A, B and C would be administered in three phases with the students getting one of the three questions with a mix of each of the three distributed in the same phase. The limitation of this technique is that each question need be formulated to require the same completion time.

#### **c. With respect to final examinations**

In terms of increasing the risk of being caught cheating borne by students prone to academic misconduct, deterrence can be maximized by following the rules and regulations appertaining to invigilation (in which, *inter alia*, the ratio of students to invigilators should be no higher than 15:1 and in no instance should there be less than two invigilators) and by denying such students access to technologies that can misemployed in the service of cheating. In this respect, rules and regulations appertaining to final examination administration bar student access to mobile phones at all times during the period in which the final examination takes place. (See Invigilation and Final Examination Administration Regulations.)

## ***Processes for Detection of Academic Misconduct***

1. All students, course instructors and project/dissertation supervisors have access to the plagiarism detection software Turnitin<sup>TM</sup>. To educate students and to facilitate detection of plagiarism, course Instructors and project supervisors require students across all levels within the University to submit essay type assignments, individual or group project reports (be they research- or non-research based), as well as undergraduate projects/post-graduate dissertations through Turnitin<sup>TM</sup>. Maximum levels of similarity are as follows:

Undergraduate assessments (all)	30%
Post-graduate assessments (other than dissertation)	20%
Post-graduate dissertations	15%

Even if similarity falls at or below the above-referenced prescribed limits, all text indicated by Turnitin<sup>TM</sup> to be “similar” must be verified to be correctly attributable by source. A student who does not indicate the source or indicates a false source is likewise deemed to have plagiarized and subject to sanction for the offense as detailed below.

In this regard it is important to note that the University has a zero tolerance approach to plagiarism. Suspected cases of plagiarism will normally be referred by the Disciplinary Committee of the University, and penalties imposed if the allegations are upheld. These penalties range from requirement to repeat the work, award of an F grade through to more serious administration actions in the case of repeat offences as detailed in the *Student Guide*.

2. As regards course work, cases of unacceptable learner practice (e.g. collusion, plagiarism or personation) are handled by the College concerned and only referred to the Dean of Student Affairs (for disciplinary hearing) if considered serious or treated as a repeat offence. Typically, minor cases result in the student being required to repeat the assessment under scrutiny through to award of an F grade for the assessment concerned. In the instance of individual major assignments/projects, in this instance applicable where accounting for 20% or more of course grade, it is vital that Turnitin<sup>TM</sup> is used to detect collusion in which identical Turnitin<sup>TM</sup> scores are obtained with identical similar text being identified by Turnitin<sup>TM</sup> indicative of collusion. The typical penalty for collusion is the award of F grades for all in collusion in the instance of a first-time offence. All instances of collusion must be reported to the Dean of Students. Repeat offenders will be subject to a hearing before the Disciplinary Committee of the University.
3. Exam offences and the corresponding penalties are dealt with according to the *Invigilation and Final Examination Administration Regulations* under the aegis of the Deanship of Student

Affairs and in conjunction with an appointed disciplinary committee. In this respect, the Deanship keeps a centralized record of all cases of exam violations in order to determine areas for enhancement in the examination and disciplinary procedures. The same penalties applicable to infraction of rules and regulations apply equally to in-class tests. Where feasible, tests applicable to multi-section courses should be conducted in single chamber according to the same rules and regulations applicable to those appertaining to final examination.

4. The University's Centre for Accreditation & Quality Assurance monitors procedures related to academic misconduct insofar as it checks that the suite of processes related to supervision of undergraduate projects and Master's level dissertation – including use of Turnitin<sup>TM</sup> - have been executed as mandated.

# Review and Amendment of Assessment Regulations

## ***Policy***

The University is committed to ensuring that its assessment policies, processes, procedures, regulations and guidelines are up-to-date, current and relevant to national and international quality guidelines and academic standards and norms; and in particular, to ensure that they comply with all NAQQAET, the NQF and HEC requirements.

To ensure completeness, currency and compliance, the University requires that all assessment policies, processes, procedures, regulations and guidelines are monitored; that feedback regarding their effectiveness is solicited regularly from all relevant stakeholders; and that these activities contribute to review, evaluation and improvement.

## ***Procedure***

1. The University assessment policies, processes, procedures, regulations and guidelines (APPPRG) stated in the Assessment Manual must be implemented across all departments and colleges.
2. The overall implementation of the APPPRG must be monitored regularly by the University Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee (TLAC) in collaboration and coordination with CAQA. In this regard CAQA is responsible for completion of the form: *Centre for Accreditation & Quality Assurance (CAQA): Monitoring the Implementation of Ahlia University Student Assessment Manual* and providing summary reports to the Dean of the concerned College so that enhancements to implementation can be made accordingly).
3. All colleges must be represented by faculty members in the TLAC and the council of CAQA. These representative faculty members must provide opinion and feedback from their college regarding the implementation of the APPPRG.
4. Feedback regarding the effectiveness of APPPRG must be regularly solicited from deans, chairpersons, faculty members and students via surveys and direct contact in university meetings.
5. The TLAC must review and evaluate the effectiveness, currency and relevancy of the APPPRG to national and international quality guidelines and academic standards and norms and especially conformity to the requirements of NAQQAET, the NQF and HEC.
6. Whenever necessary, the TLAC must revise Ahlia University Assessment Manual based on the results of review, feedback and evaluation.
7. The University Assessment Manual must be made available to all departments through various means, including through the University SharePoint.



# Form: Nomination of External Assessor/Examiner Form

Department		College	
Program under Review		Name of Program Coordinator	

Nominate up to three External Assessor/Examiners (attach a short CV as justification of suitability)

External Assessor/Examiner Name#1	Academic Rank	Affiliation
Approved: (delete as appropriate)	MBA committee :	Yes No Not Applicable
	College Council:	Yes No
	Grad Studies & Res Council	Yes No Not Applicable
	University Council:	Yes No

External Assessor/Examiner Name#2	Academic Rank	Affiliation
Approved: (delete as appropriate)	MBA committee :	Yes No Not Applicable
	College Council:	Yes No
	Grad Studies & Res Council	Yes No Not Applicable
	University Council:	Yes No

External Assessor/Examiner Name#3	Academic Rank	Affiliation
Approved: (delete as appropriate)	MBA committee :	Yes No Not Applicable
	College Council:	Yes No
	Grad Studies & Res Council	Yes No Not Applicable
	University Council:	Yes No

MBA Committee Decision Number (if applicable)	MBA Director signature	Date
College Council Decision Number	Dean's signature	Date
Grad studies & Res Council Decision Number (if applicable)	Dean's signature	Date
University Council Decision Number	President's signature	Date

## Form: Internal Verification of Course Syllabus-Specification

<b>Course Code</b>		<b>Course Title</b>	
<b>Department</b>		<b>College</b>	
<b>Number of sections</b>		<b>Academic Year</b>	
<b>Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor (as appropriate)</b>		<b>Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )</b>	
		<b>First</b>	<b>Second</b>
		<b>Summer</b>	

Verification	Yes	No	Changes suggested/Remarks
1. Is the Course Syllabus-Specification complete?			
2. Is the Course Syllabus-Specification clearly written and free from typographical errors?			
3. Are the ILOs derived from the programme specification?			
4. Are the ILOs appropriate for the type of course (e.g. theory based or practical)?			
5. Are there appropriate methods of assessment for the course ILOs?			
6. Is the weightage given to each assessment method appropriate?			
7. Is the weightage for continuous evaluation and for final examination as per University Policy?			
8. Are the dates or schedule for each assessment clearly stated and appropriately spaced across the semester?			

<b>The changes suggested have been incorporated</b>					
<b>Name of Verifier</b>		<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Name of the Chairperson/ Director</b>		<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

**Form: Internal Verification of the Major individual group Piece of course work**  
(cross out that which is inapplicable)

Course Code		Course Title			
Department		College			
Number of sections		Academic Year			
Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor (as appropriate)		Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )			
		First	Second	Summer	

Verification	Yes	No	Changes to be made/ Remarks
1. Is the assessment clearly written and free from typographical errors?			
2. Are the questions/practical tasks unambiguous in their meaning?			
3. Are the question(s)/practical tasks of a suitable type of assessment for the difficulty of the course?			
4. Are the task/question(s)/practical task and their content suitable for the level of the programme?			
5. Are the choices of question(s)/practical tasks suitable for the course/topic ILOs?			
6. Will the assessment allow students with differing abilities to demonstrate their capabilities			
7. Is the allocation of marks transparent and are the marks appropriately apportioned?			
8. Are the instructions on the front page adequate and clearly expressed?			
9. Is there a marking rubric, solutions or model answers?			
10. Does the mix of questions conform to the University guidelines for assessment methods?			
Are tasks in group work able to be distributed in a way that mitigates the risk of free-riding i.e. the group work is splittable into subroutines that can be allocated among group members without free-riding?			

By signing below the verifier also confirms that the recommended changes have been made by the Instructor

The suggested changes are made				
Name of Verifier		Signature		Date
Name of the Chairperson/ Director				

## Form: Internal Verification of Final Examination

Course Code		Course Title			
Department		College			
Number of sections		Academic Year			
Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor (as appropriate)		Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )			
		First	Second	Summer	

Verification	Yes	No	Changes to be made/ Remarks
1..Is the assessment clearly written and free from typographical errors?			
2.Are the questions/practical tasks unambiguous in their meaning?			
3.Are the question(s)/practical tasks of a suitable type of assessment for the difficulty of the course?			
4.Are the task/question(s)/practical task and their content suitable for the level of the programme?			
5.Are the choices of question(s)/practical tasks suitable for the course/topic ILOs?			
6.Will the assessment allow students with differing abilities to demonstrate their capabilities			
7.Is the allocation of marks transparent and are the marks appropriately apportioned?			
8.Are the instructions on the front page adequate and clearly expressed?			
9.Is there a marking rubric, solutions or model answers?			
10.Does the mix of questions conform to the University guidelines for assessment methods?			
11.Is the final exam comprehensive (i.e. does it cover the majority ILOs)			

By signing below the verifier also confirms that the recommended changes have been made by the Instructor

The suggested changes are made				
Name of Verifier		Signature		Date
Name of the Chairperson/ Director				

## Form: Internal Moderation of the Major Piece of Course Work

Major Piece of Work:

**individual** **group**

(cross out that which is inapplicable)

Course Code		Course Title			
Department		College			
Number of sections		Academic Year			
Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor (as appropriate)		Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )			
		First	Second	Summer	

Type of examination (e.g. written or practical)	
---	--

### Sample of major piece of course scripts for moderation

	Student I.D.	Selection Criteria (i.e. highest, average, lowest)	Mark awarded	Moderator Comments (If any)
1				
2				
3				

	Moderation of major piece of course work	Yes	No	Remarks
1.	There is a full list of marks awarded to all students for the major piece of course work			
2.	Does the marking conform to the marking scheme (based on the sample course work)?			
3.	Does the marking conform to the verified assessment criteria (based on the sample course work)?			
4.	Are the marking decisions consistent (based on the sample course work)?			
5.	Is there clear evidence, in group projects, that each team member contributed to the assessment in a meaningful way i.e. no evidence of free riding by one or more members of the group tasked with the project?			

<b><i>Have any concerns been resolved with the Course Coordinator/Instructor?</i></b>	
<b><i>If yes, what actions have been taken ?</i></b>	

<b>Name of Chairperson of Internal Moderation Committee</b>		<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	
---	--	------------------	--	-------------	--

## Form: Internal Moderation of Final Examination and Overall

Course Code		Course Title				
Department		College				
Number of sections		Academic Year				
Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor (as appropriate)		Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )				
		First		Second		Summer

Sample of Final Examination scripts for moderation				
	Student I.D.	Selection Criteria (i.e. highest, average, lowest)	Mark awarded	Moderator Comments (If any)
1				
2				
3				

Moderation of final examination results	Yes	No	Remarks
6. There is a full list of marks awarded to all students for the final examination			
7. Does the marking conform to the marking scheme (based on the sample scripts)?			
8. Does the marking conform to the verified assessment criteria (based on the sample scripts)?			
9. Are the marking decisions consistent (based on the sample scripts)?			
10. Are there any recurring themes, patterns, discrepancies (based on the sample scripts)?			
11. There is a full list of marks awarded to all student assessments for the course			
12. Distribution of overall class marks are statistically normal (for a size of $\geq 20$ students)			
13. Average class marks are within the norms for the level of the course within the College and the University as a whole			

<i>Have any concerns been resolved with the Course Coordinator/Instructor?</i>	
<i>If yes, what actions have been taken?</i>	

<b>Name of Chairperson of Internal Moderation Committee</b>		<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	
---	--	------------------	--	-------------	--



Department		College			
Name of the Program		Academic Year			
Number of Courses				Semester	
			First		Second

[illegible]

<b>Name of Chairperson/ Director</b>		<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Name of the Dean</b>		<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

## External Assessor Form (1)

### Report on Verification and Overall Matters

<b>Course Code</b>		<b>Course Title</b>				
<b>Department</b>		<b>College</b>				
<b>Number of sections</b>		<b>Academic Year</b>				
<b>Coordinator or Instructor</b>		Semester ( Please Tick ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
		<b>First</b>		<b>Second</b>		<b>Summer</b>
<b>Type of examination (e.g. written or practical)</b>						
<b>Comments of External Assessor/Examiner</b>						
<b>1 Verification of Assessment</b>						
<b>1a Specific questions</b>		<b>Remarks</b>				
<b>Major piece of course work</b>						
1. Is there a clear link between the proposed major piece of course work and the programme aims/intended learning outcomes (ILOs)?						
2. Are the allocated ILOs within the course syllabus and specifications clearly demonstrated within the questions of the proposed major piece of course work?						
3. Are the assessment methods and criteria used fair and valid to assess the level of the course?						
4. Were all students provided with the necessary teaching materials in-class to enable fair and appropriate assessment?						
5. Was the time allocated for this course work appropriate for the answers required						
<b>Final examination</b>						
6. Is there a clear link between the final examination and the programme aims/intended learning outcomes (ILOs)?						
7. Are the allocated ILOs within the course syllabus and specifications clearly demonstrated within the proposed final examination questions?						

# **External Assessor Form (1)** **Report on Verification and Overall Matters**

<b>Course Code</b>		<b>Course Title</b>			
<b>Department</b>		<b>College</b>			
<b>Number of sections</b>		<b>Academic Year</b>			
<b>Coordinator or Instructor</b>		Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )			
		<b>First</b>	<b>Second</b>	<b>Summer</b>	
<b>Type of examination (e.g. written or practical)</b>					
<b>Comments of External Assessor/Examiner</b>					
<b>1 Verification of Assessment</b>					

<b>Final examination (CONT'D)</b>					
8. Are the assessment methods and criteria used fair and valid to assess the level of the course?					
9. Does the final examination cover all the required areas and were all students provided with the necessary teaching materials in-class to enable fair and appropriate assessment?					
10. Was the duration of the exam fair for the areas to be assessed?					
<b>1b Other comments on verification of assessment</b>					
<b>2 General Comments</b>					
<b>Name of External Examiner/Assessor</b>		<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

Please return this form to the Chairperson – thank you

## External Assessor Form (2)

### Moderation of Final Examination and Overall Grade Distribution

<b>Course Code</b>		<b>Course Title</b>					
<b>Department</b>		<b>College</b>					
<b>Number of sections</b>		<b>Academic Year</b>					
<b>Coordinator or Instructor</b>		<b>Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )</b>					
			<b>First</b>		<b>Second</b>		<b>Summer</b>
<b>Type of examination (e.g. written or practical)</b>							

Moderation of overall course grades			
The external assessor/examiner will make a random selection of assessed/marked student scripts, being at least three from each performance band (high, average, low).			
<b>Number of scripts moderated</b> <i>(please include details in grid on final page)</i>			
<b>1 Specific questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<b>Major piece of course work</b>			
1. There is a full list of marks awarded to all students for the major piece of course work			
2. Does the internal marking conform to the marking scheme (based on the sample scripts)?			
3. Does the internal marking conform to the verified assessment criteria (based on the sample scripts)?			
4. Are the internal marking decisions consistent and fair (based on the sample scripts)?			
5. Are there any recurring themes, patterns, discrepancies (based on the sample scripts)?			
<b>Final examination</b>			
6. There is a full list of marks awarded to all students for the final examination			
7. There is a full list of marks awarded to all student assessments for the course			
8. Does the internal marking conform to the marking scheme (based on the sample scripts)?			

CONT'D>

## External Assessor Form (2)

### Moderation of Final Examination and Overall Grade Distribution

<b>Course Code</b>		<b>Course Title</b>			
<b>Department</b>		<b>College</b>			
<b>Number of sections</b>		<b>Academic Year</b>			
<b>Coordinator or Instructor</b>		Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )			
		First	Second	Summer	

Type of examination (e.g. written or practical)

#### Moderation of overall course grades

The external assessor/examiner will make a random selection of assessed/marked student scripts, being at least three from each performance band (high, average, low).

**Number of scripts moderated**

(please include details in grid on final page)

#### Final examination (CONT'D)

9. Does the internal marking conform to the verified assessment criteria (based on the sample scripts)?

10. Are the internal marking decisions consistent and fair (based on the sample scripts)?

11. Are there any recurring themes, patterns, discrepancies (based on the sample scripts)?

#### Overall Grade Distribution

12. Distribution of overall class marks are statistically normal (for a size of  $\geq 20$  students)

13. Average class marks are within the norms for the level of the course within the College and the University as a whole

#### 2 General comments

--

CONT'D>

**External Assessor Form (2)**  
**Moderation of Final Examination and Overall**  
**Grade Distribution**

<b>Course Code</b>		<b>Course Title</b>					
<b>Department</b>		<b>College</b>					
<b>Number of sections</b>		<b>Academic Year</b>					
<b>Coordinator or Instructor</b>		Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )					
			<b>First</b>		<b>Second</b>		<b>Summer</b>
<b>Type of examination (e.g. written or practical)</b>							
<b>Moderation of overall course grades</b>							
The external assessor/examiner will make a random selection of assessed/marked student scripts, being at least three from each performance band (high, average, low).							
<b>Number of scripts moderated</b>							
(please include details in grid on final page)							

<b>Concerns</b>	
<i>Have any concerns been resolved with the chairperson and Course Coordinator/Instructor?</i>	
<i>If yes, what actions have been taken?</i>	

CONT'D>

## External Assessor Form (2)

### Moderation of Final Examination and Overall Grade Distribution

<b>Course Code</b>		<b>Course Title</b>	
<b>Department</b>		<b>College</b>	
<b>Number of sections</b>		<b>Academic Year</b>	
<b>Coordinator or Instructor</b>		Semester ( Please Tick ✓ )	
		First	Second
		Summer	
<b>Type of examination (e.g. written or practical)</b>			

#### Moderation of overall course grades

The external assessor/examiner will make a random selection of assessed/marked student scripts, being at least three from each performance band (high, average, low).

**Number of scripts moderated**

*(please include details in grid on final page)*

<b>Name of External Examiner/Assessor</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	
<b>Date</b>	

#### Record of final examination and Major Piece of work scripts moderated

	Student ID	Grade band (high, average, low)	Mark awarded	Comments/suggestion for change (if any)
--	------------	------------------------------------	--------------	---

<b>Major Piece of Work</b>				
1				
2				
3				

<b>Final Examination</b>				
4				
5				
6				

[illegible]

## ***Generic rubric for Class/Oral Participation***

<b>Element</b>	<b>Fail (&lt;59%) to D (60-66%)</b>	<b>C (67-76%) to B (77-86%)</b>	<b>A (87-100%)</b>
<i>Attendance</i>	Has missed >15% of classes but less than threshold for “W” grade.	Has missed 5-15% of classes	Near perfect attendance record
<i>Frequency of participation</i>	Does not participate in, or alternatively dominates class discussions or practical/clinical sessions.	Occasionally participates in class discussions or practical/clinical sessions.	Regularly participates in class discussions or practical/clinical sessions. Initiates questions.
<i>Respect</i>	Disrespectful to, or talks over, fellow students, clients/patients or Instructor. Disregards feedback.	Respects and listens to fellow students, clients/patients or Instructor. Does not apply feedback	Respects and listens to fellow students, clients/patients or Instructor. Considers and applies feedback
<i>Inclusiveness</i>	Does not mention contribution of others, or fails to further develop ideas previously discussed.	Implies contribution of others; bases argument on his/her previous assumptions and contributions.	Builds on other students’ ideas, synthesizing across readings, practical/clinical work and class discussions; expands the class’ perspective, and appropriately challenges professional norms, assumptions, and perspectives.
<i>Relevance and insight</i>	Misses the ‘big picture’. Makes marginal or irrelevant contributions to the discussion.	Misses the ‘big picture’. Makes contributions to parts of the discussion.	Awareness of the ‘big picture’. Raises relevant and insightful comments or questions. Adds important facts or perspectives.
<i>Terminology and vocabulary</i>	Little or no attempt to use terminology and/or vocabulary in conversation.	Mispronounced, misused and/or sporadic use of terminology and/or vocabulary.	Relevant and fluent terminology and/or vocabulary and pronunciation.
<i>Critical thinking</i>	Demonstrates little or no understanding of the specific issues being discussed.	Demonstrates some understanding of the specific issues being discussed.	Demonstrates a clear understanding of the specific issues being discussed.

*The College, Department or Instructors concerned can choose which of the elements to include in the assessment of class participation.*

## ***Glossary***

**Aims** are the broad orientation and intentions of a course or degree programme (i.e. what the programme/course offers the student).

**Assessment** describes any processes that evaluate the outcomes of student learning in terms of knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and abilities.

**Assignments** can take a variety of formats including, but not limited to: essays, portfolios, projects, take-home tests, or other types of coursework.

**Case studies** are student-centered activities based on topics that demonstrate theoretical concepts in an applied setting. Case studies encourage learning of course content, analysis and key skills such as time-management. Students may be required to summarise the activity in a written report or oral presentation. Assessment may be formative or summative.

**Constructive alignment** is the process of linking ILOs, teaching and learning, to the method(s) of assessment.

**Examinations** are a type of summative assessment, typically longer than a test, and use to measure for example: knowledge, skills, aptitude, analysis and synthesis. It may be written, practical and/or oral. The final examination covers the majority of the ILOs and topics for a course.

**Formative assessment** provides a means to enhance student learning - also referred to as ‘**assessment for learning**’. Formative assessments generally have low or no point value. Examples of formative assessments include quizzes, tests, asking students to submit a research proposal for early feedback or submitting a short paragraph summarising the main points of a lecture.

**Intended learning outcomes** describe what the student should be able to do or demonstrate, with respect to particular knowledge, skills and attitudes, by the end of the course or programme. In addition they help determine appropriate methods of assessment.

**Oral examinations** consist of an Assessor posing questions to the student in a spoken format. The student is expected to answer questions rapidly and to demonstrate sufficient

knowledge of the topic. It is a core part of the examination for the undergraduate final year project and the Master's dissertation.

**Practical skills test (or exam)** is typically, but not exclusively an assessment of the ability to integrate and apply specific technical skills, professional behaviours and communication skills to address a question or solve a problem in the laboratory, or other practice setting, as appropriate. For example, a clinical practical exam is an assessment of a student health professional's ability to integrate and apply clinical, professional, communication and practical skills appropriate for their respective specialisation.

**Projects** can take the form of a small independent, directed piece of research to address a particular problem/question and resulting in the production of a written report and/or oral presentation. In the case of the final year undergraduate project or the Master's dissertation this may involve actual laboratory or field work.

**Quizzes** are typically brief, informal written or oral test used to assess knowledge (e.g. multiple-choice, true/false or short-answer questions), but can also take the form of short numerical/analytical problems.

**Tests** are a longer form of a quiz, typically formal and written, and can also include essay-type questions.

**Assignments** are takeaway/homework tests, generally used to test higher abilities such as analytical skills, synthesis and creativity.

**Reliable assessment** methods would be expected to give the same results if repeated under the same conditions.

**Summative assessment** provides a means by which to judge and certify student achievements – also known as '**assessment of learning**'. Summative assessments generally have a high point value. Examples of summative assessments include a mid-semester exam, a laboratory manual or a final examination.

**Valid assessment** methods measure most appropriately, achievement of the particular ILO/ set of ILOs.

### Generic ILO-Teaching & Learning-Assessment-NQF descriptor linkage matrix

	ILO	Description	Teaching & learning Strategy options	Assessment Method options	*Probable Mapping to NQF
<i>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</i>	<b>A1</b>	Theory and concepts	Lecturing, Class discussions, Independent Learning, E-learning	closed book examinations (mid-terms, finals), quizzes, oral enquiry, graded homework	Knowledge: Theoretical Understanding
	<b>A2</b>	Trends, problems and research	Seminars, Independent Learning, E-learning	on-line research, research projects, writing literature reviews and research, book, article reviews	Knowledge: Theoretical Understanding
	<b>A3</b>	professional responsibility	Lecturing, Class discussions, Independent Learning, E-learning, worked based learning	practical training exercise (external), simulations/role-play, external visit/ visitor reportage	Knowledge: Theoretical Understanding Competence : Autonomy, responsibility and Context
<i>Subject Specific Skills</i>	<b>B1</b>	problem solving skills	Demonstrations (by faculty member showing how to solve a problem), In class/lab or practice-based supervised work	problem sets, graded homework, in-lab exercises, examinations	Knowledge: Practical Application Skills: Communication, ICT & Numeracy
	<b>B2</b>	Modeling and design	In class /lab supervised work, computer aided design/modeling, simulation	projects, in-lab exercises	Knowledge: Practical Application
	<b>B3</b>	Application of tools and methods	In lab exercises using software, simulation, practical skills laboratory, clinical tool/machine usage (in-lab/on work site)	in-lab exercises (involving software), projects	Knowledge: Practical Application Skills: Communication, ICT & Numeracy
<i>Critical thinking skills</i>	<b>C1</b>	Analytical skills	In class supervised work, in-class (group) work, Independent Learning, Class participation including socratic method	Case studies, exams (closed book or open), oral inquiry	Generic Problem Solving & Analytical skills
	<b>C2</b>	Synthetic skills**	In class supervised work, Independent learning, in-lab or practice-based skills sessions	(open or closed) book examinations, case analysis	Generic Problem Solving & Analytical skills
		strategic thinking skills**	In class supervised work, Independent learning simulation	(open or closed) book examinations, case analysis, simulations	Generic Problem Solving & Analytical skills
	<b>C3</b>	creative thinking and innovation	In class supervised work, Independent Learning, Laboratory or practice-based skills sessions, Work-based learning, Class discussions	(open or closed) book examinations, simulations, multi-task projects, graded homework	Generic Problem Solving & Analytical skills Competence : Autonomy, responsibility and Context

**Generic ILO-Teaching/Learning-Assessment/NQF Linkage matrix [CONT'D]**

	ILO	Description	Teaching & learning Strategy options	Assessment Method options	*Probable Mapping to NQF*
<b>General &amp; Transferable skills</b>	<b>D1</b>	communications skills	Oral presentation/participation, In-class or out-of-class writing practice, debate, role-play, Dissertation supervision	Oral participation/inquiry, debate, essay-based exams (closed-book or open) involving essays, essay, (project) report writing, oral presentation,	Skills: Communication, ICT & Numeracy
	<b>D2</b>	Teamwork and leadership	In-class group work/ role-play, group (research) projects	Group projects, group discussions, group in-class/lab work	Competence : Autonomy, responsibility and Context
	<b>D3</b>	organizational and developmental skills	Demonstration, Independent learning; in-class supervised work, dissertation supervision	Assignments (involving techniques or organizing information or involving progressive skill development); research project (involving extraction of relevant data); reflective practice record,	Competence : Autonomy, responsibility and Context
	<b>D4</b>	ethics and social responsibility	Lectures, In-class (group) work, Class participation/debate, Independent learning, E-Learning, work-based learning	Case studies, examinations (closed book), lab or work-based observation, essay	Competence : Autonomy, responsibility and Context

*\*Probably Mapping to NQF substrands but additional substrands may apply. \*\* For ILO C2, strategic thinking is more appropriate for Master's level courses, whilst synthetic skills are more appropriate for undergraduate level.*