Ahlia University Assessment Manual (Cross Border Qualifications)

Ref: UC/P 549/2022

As approved by University Council Decision No. UC/2215/07/2021-22 of meeting No. UC/07/2021-22 held on Wednesday the 26th of January 2022.

Ahlia University Assessment Manual
(Cross Border Qualifications)

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) *comply with* external accreditation *and quality assurance* requirements (5) comply with awarding body policies and procedures. 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 by the awarding body, and that the regulations are applied fairly and consistently across the hosting colleges.

The purpose of the AU Assessment Manual cross border is to ensure effective implementation of the academic planning framework with assurance that the qualification is offered in compliance with the awarding body requirements as well as the QA standards and regulatory requirement for the hosting Institution.

The assessment manual (cross border) covers assessment processes (internal and external) that assures maintaining alignment with NQF and covering local context requirements to assure learners progression.

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.
2. Students must demonstrate a designated level of achievement on all ILOs in order to obtain credit for the course *with appropriate level of complexity in line with NQF placed level.*
3. 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. See Appendix: *to Generic ILO- Teaching & Learning Assessment NQF Descriptor linkage Matrix to support assessment method selection.*
4. Course assessments must include *formative methods* mapped to the 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).

5. The assessment grade allocation should be in compliance with the awarding body grading breakdown (eg. 40% final exam, 30-35% mid-term and 25% course work (overall 100%)

6. 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) contextual real life issues (4) Subject and discipline (5) professional frameworks where appropriate (6) Benchmarks *(7) Complex and in line with NQF Level.*

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 Descriptor linkage Matrix to support assessment method selection.)*

The design team and course instructor/coordinator are required to refer to the University's generic template for linkage of (university wide) ILOs (*see Appendix Course Syllabus/Specification Template as a guiding tool for NQF alignment*), teaching methods, assessment methods and aligned to NQF descriptors (see Appendix *NQF level Descriptors*) when preparing the assessment scheme for programmes and courses. However, the template is a basic guide and should not be considered exhaustive or limiting and the design of assessment should be in compliance with the awarding body. 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. **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 should be designed accordingly. The components of assessment are as follows:

   a. 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, *design project, portfolio*, research projects and oral participation/presentation but specifically excluding attendance is worth 25-30%. [1]

   b. The mid-term (which may be written, practical/clinical or a combination of these) is worth 30-35% of total marks for a course.

   c. The final exam (which may be written, practical/clinical or a combination of these) is worth 40% of total marks for a course.

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*'. *See Appendix for NQF level descriptors and ILOs terminologies*

1 It is the responsibility of the department/college council in coordination with the course instructor/coordinator to determine the programme and/or course intended learning outcomes.

2 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 *and share the student overall grade for the course work which is out of 60% including students attending cross border qualifications that is awarded by other Higher Education Institution.*

Procedure:

1. The course instructor/coordinator must ensure that the course syllabus/specification (which details the course aims, objectives, ILOs, teaching and assessment methods and schedule considering the awarding body policies and procedure), 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 sub marks 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 and a copy of the final verified final exam along with key solution is secured with the chairperson in case of any emergency UC/1736/07/2017-18.*

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 expected complexity from the students in line with NQF level requirements*
   - 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.
- *Academic Misconduct regulations and (%) of similarity allowed or other code of conduct (where applicable)*

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 both 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. This procedure is also applied for cross border qualifications.

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.

6. 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 *and a copy of the final verified final exam along with key solution is secured with the chairperson in case of any emergency* until the time of release to students.

3. The instructor must distribute the assessment question papers to students at the due time either directly or in collaboration with other invigilators.

4. On completion of the paper-based assessment, the instructor and/or other invigilator(s) must collect the answer scripts from students.

5. The students' scripts must be marked by the instructor in conditions of full and complete security and confidentiality.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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 *and a copy of the final verified final exam along with key solution is secured with the chairperson in case of any emergency* 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.

2. *Each Instructor is responsible to ensure that the results of all the assessments are documented within ILOs Achievement Matrix – Excel Sheet which generates the % of ILOs achievement, the excel sheet is required to be uploaded in ADREG system while entering the overall grade.*

3. 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).

4. 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 *two* years. *Course file which includes sample of 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.

5. Copies of the overall documented course files are also shared with the awarding body for review and scrutiny of the content in terms of adherence of policies, procedures and equivalencies.

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 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)

Internal Verification and Moderation

Introduction

This section explains the principles, policies and procedures for:

1. Internal verification of the course syllabus-specification, *major piece of work (where applicable)* and final examination for all taught courses at Ahlia University (including courses as part of cross border qualifications)

2. Internal moderation of the marking for *major piece of work (where applicable)* and final examinations and the overall grade distribution for all taught courses (but excluding 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

d. Validity of the complexity level of assessment in line with the NQF placed level.

e. Adherence to the awarding body policies and procedures

f. Coverage of contextual based materials and related assessments

4. 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).

5. 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

d. The marking criteria or rubric for evaluating the practical component of the courses including the major piece of coursework and final examination if applicable

6. The verification process for the Course Syllabus-Specification, major piece of course work, the marking criteria or rubric for the practical component of the courses 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 for (cross border qualification)*

b. *Internal Verification of the major piece of course work for (cross border qualification)*

c. *Internal Verification of the Final Exam for (cross border qualification)*

7. 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 *and placed within the Course File that is shared with the awarding body electronically*

Process: Internal verification of course specification or syllabus/specification

1. The Chairperson of the Department/*Programme Coordinator* 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[3] 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 Course 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. In case of major revisions, communication will be made with the awarding body.
4. The completed form, original and the final version of the assessment are forwarded to the Chairperson*/ Programme Coordinator* for record keeping *and placed within the Course File,* as well as used 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 Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee (if any)

---

[3] 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 Internal Verifier with the documents

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

1. Normally, the Internal Verifier is the same person responsible for checking the course syllabi/specifications prior to the start of the semester.

2. The Instructor provides the Internal Verifier with the major piece of course work and final examination paper as well as the marking criteria and solutions, marking criteria or rubric for the Practical component of the courses, model answers or rubric and model answers as appropriate, at least two weeks before these assessments are conducted.

3. The Internal 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 Internal Verifier submits the completed form, original and the final version of the assessment to the Chairperson/ Programme Coordinator for secure record keeping *and placed within the Course File.*, as well as 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 *Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee (if any)*

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 *Programme Coordinator*), and one other faculty member.

2. All courses will have their major piece of course work, final examinations and overall grade distribution *as documented within ILOs achievement matrix – excel sheet internally moderated*

3. As a minimum requirement, moderation should consist of:

   a. A review of the major piece of coursework 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 of ILOs achievement rate which is 60% and incase of any ILO did not attain the % actions to be taken by the department. (The attainment rate may be set higher than 60% as per the college requirement)*

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/ Programme Coordinator *and placed within the Course File.*

Process: Internal Moderation

1. The Chairperson (or *Programme Coordinator*) forms the Internal Moderation Committee which normally consists of the concerned Course Instructor/Coordinator (in the case of multi-section courses), the Chairperson/*Programme Coordinator*.

2. The Chairperson/ *Programme Coordinator* 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 *documented within ILO Achievement Matrix* 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 *Programme Coordinator*) for record-keeping *and placed at the course file*, as well as 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 Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee (if any).

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 dissertation and Project).

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/specification; (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, all non-service courses applicable to the programme specialization, are covered. *Such implies that all offered courses in a degree programme are moderated and verified within a 2 years cycle*. The owner of this process is the chairperson/Proragmme Review Coordinator charged with running

the programme in coordination with the departmental council. For service courses, the courses should be forwarded for external moderations once annually making sure that all the courses offered are externally moderated, the owner of the process is the dean of the college.

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, <u>summer term is excluded</u>. For service courses, the order of moderation and verification is solely derived from descending order ranking.

Policy for Nomination of External Assessor/Examiner

<u>**Inclusion criteria**</u>

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 programme and/or Master's Degree with 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 as an external Assessor/Examiner within the last two years at Ahlia University or extended for re-appointment.

5. Any person with a close professional, 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.

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. *However, one external assessor/examiner cannot be appointed for more than two academic programmes at Ahlia University*

The appointment period for external assessor/examiners is two years, an extension of 2 years is possible subjected to an official request by the College and approval by University Council.

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

2. *Courses offered as part of Postgraduate Programmes should be coordinated by the offering department.*

3. Finally, the nominations are forwarded to the University Council for approval. If all nominations are approved, then the Chairperson/Programme Coordinator 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 *could be extended for two years subjected for approval by University Council.*

6. The External Assessment process begins once the nominee has agreed to participate.

Procedures and Process: External assessment

1. Role of the Chairperson/ Programme Coordinator

1.1. The Chairperson/Programme Coordinator 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/Programme Coordinator shall arrange for the External Assessor/Examiner to visit the University and undertake the verification and moderation process. 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:
   a) Written confirmation of his/her appointment and the Schedule of meetings
   b) Hard/e-copy of the current *Course Directory*
   c) The University Assessment Manual
   d) The Programme specifications, Course syllabus/specification
   e) Major piece of course work, final examination paper and marking criteria, as well as solutions, model answers or rubrics as appropriate
   f) The External Assessor/Examiner Forms E1 and E2

g) Students' final exam scripts for courses offered in the Semester

h) *ILOs Achievement Matrix- Excel Sheet highlighting the ILOs attainment rate and overall grade distribution*

1.4 The Chairperson/Programme Coordinator 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.

1.5 The Chairperson/Programme Coordinator 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. The feedback from the external assessor/examiner will be used for the upcoming course offering. *In case of major revision that impact on the overall course content, it should be communicated to the awarding body through the authorized channels for final decision.*

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/Programme Coordinator of the Programme immediately after the verification/moderation process is completed.

Supporting Documents to be forwarded to the external assessor/ examiner

a) Course Syllabus Specification of the Course

b) Samples of Major Piece of Work (*if applicable*)
c) Samples of Final Exam
d) ILOs Achievement Matrix
e) Programme Study Plan
f) Programme Specification
g) Course Directory
h) NQF Level Descriptors

Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) Achievement Procedure

Course ILOs Achievement Procedure

a. **Purpose**: The purpose of measuring the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) per course is to assure that the learners has attained the required learning outcomes throughout the learning period of the course. The course ILO achievement also feeds in the Programme ILOs achievement through aggregation of data every semester by the concerned cohort.

b. **Frequency of Implementation:** Upon the conduct of Internal Moderation as part of AU Assessment Manual, ILOs achievement should be conducted every semester.

Role of the Instructor/Coordinator of Multi-Section Course:

Every faculty member should fill the excel sheet in line with the below classified steps:

a. **Step 1:** Upon verification of the course syllabus as part of AU Assessment Manual, the instructor must fill sheet 1 pertaining to general information and include the CILOs verified and relate them with assessment methods.

b. **Step 2:** Upon verification of the assessment appropriateness to the level of the course as part of AU Assessment Manual, each faculty member is required to assess the CILOs using various assessment activities as verified within the syllabus such as test, quiz, final exam etc. (for more information refer to ILOs teaching & learning and assessment matrix)

c. **Step 3:** The faculty member should define how each assessment method is mapped to the CILOs, for the assessments above 20% should be internally verified and moderated as part of AU Assessment Manual

d. **Step 4:** The course assessment workbook (CAW) will generate a measure for CILO attainment as well as a chart "dashboard" highlighting the level of CILOs attainment as course.

e. **Step 5:** The faculty member should forward the course assessment workbook (CAW) to the chairperson for discussion at departmental level, in case of ILOs did not score (60% or above) the faculty should provide his/her justification Note * *(The attainment rate may be set higher than 60% as per the college requirement)*

Role of the Chairperson/ Programme Coordinator:

Every semester chairperson/ Programme Coordinator should conduct the following actions:

a. **Action 1**: Chairpersons must ensure that CILOs achievement procedure is conducted for all the offered courses (including multi-section)

b. **Action 2:** Chairperson should discuss the results at departmental level and ensure that all the courses achieved their ILOs for those ILOs they did not score 60% or above a clear improvement plan should be developed at departmental level to improve the content of the course.

c. **Action 3:** Chairperson must aggregate the data from each course assessment workbook (CAW) and develop Programme ILOs achievement considering the cohort analysis and suggest any modification to the programme ILOs to the college council.

d. **Action 4:** Following the implementation of the corrective actions, the department should then monitor the progress in PILO attainment and determine if the change was successful. This should be illustrated in graphs that clearly shows the progress.

Role of the Dean of the College:

a. The dean must ensure that every department has conducted the CILOs and PILOs procedure for their offered courses/programmes and discuss any improvement actions (if needed)

Programme ILOs Achievement Procedure

a. **Purpose**: The purpose of measuring the Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) is to assure that the learners have attained the required learning outcomes throughout the learning period of the study. The Programme ILO achievement also feeds into the achievement of the graduate attributes in line with the University Teaching and Learning Plan through aggregating course ILOs achievement of all the offered courses every semester.

b. **Frequency of Implementation:** Upon the conduct of Internal Moderation as part of AU Assessment Manual, ILOs achievement should be conducted every semester

Role of the Instructor/Coordinator of Multi-Section Course:

a. Every faculty member should fill the excel sheet in line with steps stated within the "Course ILOs achievement procedure UC/P286/2018"and forward the filled version to the course verifier/moderator for review as part of Internal Moderation of Final Exam Process

b. The faculty members should submit the signed version after the review by the course verifier/moderator to the chairperson of the department for further discussion.

c. Upon discussion at department council and approval the course assessment workbook (CAW) will be forwarded to the chairperson for conducting the PILOs achievement procedure

Role of the Chairperson/ Programme Coordinator:

The chairperson of the department is responsible to collect all the course assessment workbook (CAW) of all the offered courses within the semester. The chair should map the all courses' ILOs to the Programme Intended Learning outcomes by filling the excel sheet "PILOs assessment matrix" and initiate the following actions:

a. **Action** 1: The chairperson must collect all the course assessment workbook (CAW) and collate all the information within the "PILOs assessment matrix".

b. **Action 2:** Chairperson should discuss the results at departmental level and ensure that each course achieved its ILOs and will positively contribute to the attainment of PILOs. For those courses whose ILOs that did not meet the threshold (60%) a clear improvement plan should be developed at departmental level to improve the content of that specific course. Note * *(The attainment rate may be set higher than 60% as per the college requirement)*

c. **Action 3:** Chairperson must assure the PILO attainment rate for all the PILOs within the Programme is attained. In case ILOs they did not score (60% or above)a clear improvement plan should be developed at departmental level to improve the content of the programme

d. **Action 4:** Following the implementation of the corrective actions, the department should then monitor the progress in PILO attainment and determine if the change was successful. This should be illustrated in graphs that clearly shows the progress

Role of the Dean of the College:

a. The dean must ensure that every department has conducted the CILOs and PILOs procedure for their offered courses/programmes and discuss any improvement actions (if needed)

Quality Assurance required documentation:

Roles and Responsibilities of the Chairperson:

a. Documented all the filled course assessment workbook (CAW) discussed and finalized by departmental council
b. The filled "PILOs assessment matrix"
c. Minutes of the department council discussing the results of the Course and PILOs attainment rate
d. Improvement Plan (if applicable)

Roles and Responsibilities of the Dean:

a. Minutes of the College Council discussing the PILOs attainment rate
b. Improvement Plan (if applicable)

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 as well as the awarding body policies and procedures 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 postgraduate programmes* offered by the University including cross

border qualifications. The grades are communicated to the awarding body for standards maintenance prior to its approval and approved by the awarding body.

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 final the ILOS achievement template –excel Sheet (CAW) and* 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/marking 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 *final the ILOS achievement template –excel Sheet (CAW)* (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. *The department council must take into account any modification to the grades suggested by the external assessor/examiner (if any) and take an action.*

7. If the department offers any course to the *Postgraduate Programme*, the approved grades of

these courses must be submitted to the *Programme Coordinator* for endorsement and thereafter the grades of these courses are treated just like other courses.

8. The grades are then forwarded by the programme coordinator to the awarding body for approval in terms of compliance with awarding body policies and procedures and standards. Upon approval the grades are forwarded to the department council.

9. 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 and upload the *final the ILOS achievement template −excel Sheet (CAW)*.

10. 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.

11. 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 Postgraduate Programme, the Programme coordinator must submit a summary report of the Programme's grades to the Dean of the College offering the prorgamme.

12. 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 should be communicated 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 Students Affairs 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 embedded 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 m u s t photocopy sample of 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 *which is out of 60%.* 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

Academic misconduct

Policy

In a small number of cases there are students who are tempted to gain an unfair advantage on their undergraduate projects. This behavior is considered unacceptable. There are at least six types of academic misconduct, which Ahlia University acknowledges and wishes to prevent: (1) plagiarism; (2) data falsification; (3) use of third-parties (tacit personation) or cheat-ware sites; (4) free-riding collusion; (5) recyling collusion; and (6) active 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. **Data Falsification** is an act involving willful creation of false data as in students in the project filling out questionnaires themselves rather than distributing them and soliciting legimate feedback from the population or changing data collected on received questionnaires

3. **Use of third parties (tacit personation) or cheat ware sites** which, typically for a fee, write all or part of a manuscript or design a model that students in the project then present as their own original work. (However, cohorts may use a professional proofreading service provided that they declare use of such a service.) When third parties prepare academic work-product for one (or more) cohort members, a form of tacit **personation** results.

4. **Free riding collusion** involves one student (or more) in the project cohort doing work on behalf of another who in fact makes no contribution to the project. In free riding collusion both the student(s) not doing any work as well as the other(s) doing work at the behest of the former, who passes such work off as his/her own are liable.

5. **Recycling collusion** involves one student (or more) in the project cohort enlisting outside-the-cohort support of one student (or more) whose previously submitted academic work product is fobbed off as being the unique intellectual work product of those concerned conspiring project cohort members.

6. **Active Personation** occurs when one (or more) students outside the cohort subsitute for one (or more) students in the project cohort proffering false identities at the time of project defense (in the admittedly unlikely scenario of the project supervisor not remembering the physical appearance of each member of the cohort).

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 the Supervision of the Master's Degree Dissertation, 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 practice(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. It is advisable that for any objective test component using multiple choice format that two sets of question sets be developed using the same questions in random order and randomizing the answer choices such that what appears as (a) on one set appears as (b) on another set. (See Invigilation and Final Examination Administration Regulations.)

D. With regard to Assignments and Written projects:

All assignments and written projects should be submitted electronically through Moodle, a plagiarism detection software Turnitin™ is linked to Moodle and provide the percentage of similarity to the faculty members by generating a detailed report highlighting the phrases and references. Course Instructors and Supervisors are required to check the student's submitted work and as per the report generated from Turnitin™ to judge the percentage of similarity and assure it is within university allowed norms.

C. With respect to Design Studio and Visual:

All Interior Design Projects and Portfolios should be checked against academic misconduct through the application of "Visual Plagiarism policy and procedure" which covers the

guidelines to understand the visual Plagiarism and various levels of verification. The policy is applicable for all In-lab work, sketchbook, portfolios, and any other student work which involves visual application. Faculty members must check the student work against Visual Plagiarism and verify its content by using "level of verification checklist".

Processes for Detection of Academic Misconduct

   a. Process for Detection Misconduct of Assignments and Written Projects

   All students, course instructors and project/dissertation supervisors have access to the plagiarism detection software Turnitin™. 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 dissertation through Turnitin™ 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 TurnitinTM to be "similar" must be verified to been correctly attributed 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.

   Signs of illegitimate use of paraphrasing software, either to facilitate collusion or plagiarism, can be augured from obvious lack of idiomatic expression combined with inapt synonyms being used e.g. a case involving a CEO Jimmy Diamond, whose name in one instance is changed to Jimmy Gem and in another to Jimmy Ruby! Any case should be laced with several markers, the changing of which would be indicative of improper use of paraphrasing software. An example of a marker would be to change the name of a person from Mr. Esposito (whose name would not generate a synonym through paraphrasing software) to Mr. Smart (whose name would be changed, though the application of the paraphrasing software, to Mr. Intelligent, Mr. Clever, etc.). 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.**

C. Process for Detection Misconduct of Design Studio and Visual:

Visual plagiarism can be tackled, although not with the accuracy of Turn-it-in with respect to textual plagiarism, through digitalizing artwork and scanning using reverse image search engines: Google/Yandex/Bing/TinEye. Photos can be assessed with even greater rigor both through the same and through an analysis of meta-data generated by the camera. Student-snapped photos without meta-data should be removed portfolio as should any copyrighted photos, collected not snapped by the student, absent permission from the copyright holder. Best practices with respect to digital plagiarism are encapsulated in https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7d48/5012fda313b1b4a9132d8055096e0b6ffeee.pdf (accessed on 25/10/2019) as well as the application of *"Visual Plagiarism policy and procedure"*

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.**

C. Process for Detection Misconduct of Course Work:

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^{TM} is

used to detect collusion in which identical Turnitin^{TM} scores are obtained with identical similar text being identified by Turnitin^{TM} 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.

D. Process for Detection Misconduct of Final Examination:

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 of Student Affairs 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.

The University's Teaching and Learning Centre in coordination with 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™ – have been executed as mandated. All the policies and procedures regarding penalties and violations are communicated to students through the student handbook.

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)	Department Council	Yes	No	Decision Number	
	College Council:	Yes	No	Decision Number	

External Assessor/Examiner Name#2		Academic Rank		Affiliation	
Approved: (delete as appropriate)	Department Council	Yes	No	Decision Number	
	College Council:	Yes	No	Decision Number	

External Assessor/Examiner Name#3		Academic Rank		Affiliation	
Approved: (delete as appropriate)	Department Council	Yes	No	Decision Number	
	College Council:	Yes	No	Decision Number	

This form to be completed and forwarded to University Council for Appointment for the nominated external assessor/examiner.

Department Council	Chairperson Signature	Date
College Council	Dean's signature	Date

Form: Internal Verification of Course Syllabus-Specification (Cross Border Qualifications)

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 suggested/Remarks**
1. *Is the Course Syllabus-Specification complete in terms of content and assessments?*			
2. *Is the Course Syllabus-Specification clearly written and free from typographical errors?*			
3. *Are the ILOs derived from the programme specification and aligned to NQF level descriptors?*			
4. *Are the ILOs appropriate for the type of course (e.g. theory based or practical)?*			
5. *Are the ILOs mapped to the appropriate NQF level and reflect the complexity of outcomes expected from the student?*			
6. *The course is supplemented with appropriate course materials that fit with its delivery method and cover contextual based materials*			
7. *Are there appropriate methods of assessment for the course ILOs?*			
8. *Is the weightage given to each assessment method appropriate and in line with the awarding body ?*			

9. *Is the weightage for continuous evaluation and for final examination as per awarding body policy?*			
10. *Are the dates or schedule for each assessment clearly stated and appropriately spaced across the semester?*			
11. *In case of assessments contain Turn-in-it in checking the (%) of similarity is clearly indicated*			
12. *The course is supported with formative and summative assessment to support student progression*			

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

The changes suggested have been incorporated					
Name of Internal Verifier		**Signature**		**Date**	
Name of Programme Coordinator/ Chairperson		**Signature**		**Date**	

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

(Cross Border Qualifications)

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 suggested/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. Are the assessment questions assessing the complexity level in line with the mapped NQF mapped level?			
7. Does the assessment cover all the ILOs that is expected to be assessed in line with the verified course syllabus?			
8. Will the assessment allow students with differing abilities to demonstrate their capabilities			
9. Is the allocation of marks transparent and are the marks appropriately apportioned?			
10. Are the instructions on the front page adequate and clearly expressed?			
11. Is there a marking rubric, solutions or model answers?			

12. *Is there a Marking criteria or rubric for the Practical component of the courses (if applicable)*			
13. *Does the mix of questions conform to the awarding body guidelines for assessment methods?*			
14. *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 split table into subroutines that can be allocated among group members without free-riding?*			
15. *Does the assessment include process of detecting misconduct as per the awarding body which includes (%) of similarity allowed (if applicable)*			

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 Programme Coordinator/ Chairperson		**Signature**		**Date**	

Form: Internal Verification of Final Examination (Cross Border Qualifications)

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 suggested/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 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. Are the questions clearly marked with the corresponding ILO's that is being addressed?			
7. Are the assessment questions assessing the complexity level in line with the mapped NQF mapped level?			
8. Does the assessment cover all the ILOs that is expected to be assessed in line with the verified course syllabus?			
9. Will the assessment allow students with differing abilities to demonstrate their capabilities			
10. Is the allocation of marks transparent and are the marks appropriately apportioned?			
11. Are the instructions on the front page adequate and clearly expressed?			
12. Is there a marking rubric, solutions or			

model answers?			
13. *Is there a Marking criteria or rubric for the Practical component of the courses (if applicable)*			
14. *Does the mix of questions conform to the University guidelines for assessment methods?*			
15. *Is the final exam comprehensive (i.e. does it cover the majority ILOs)*			
16. *The amount of the questions is appropriate for the duration of final exam?*			

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

The suggested changes are made					
Name of Internal Verifier		**Signature**		**Date**	
Name of the Chairperson/ Programme Coordinator		**Signature**		**Date**	

Form: Internal Moderation of the Major Piece of Course Work (cross border qualification)

(Cross out that which is inapplicable)

individual	group

Major Piece of Work:

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. ILOs achievement matrix (CAW) states 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.	In case of written work that is based on critical analysis, grading was found fair and consistent?		
6.	The student samples indicated the complexity required in line with NQF mapped level?		
7.	Is there any ILOs did not attain 60% out of the assessment?		
8.	In case of any ILO is unattained is there any action taken to support attainment the ILO prior to the end of the course?		
9.	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? (A table with task distribution and participants contribution is group project is submitted as evidence)		
10.	Is there an evidence of feedback provided on the overall assessment to inform student progression?		

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

Name of Chairperson of Internal Moderation Committee		Signature		Date	

Form: Internal Moderation of Final Examination and Overall (cross border qualification)

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
1. ILOs achievement matrix (CAW) states marks awarded to all students for the final examination			
2. Does the marking conform to the marking scheme (based on the sample scripts)?			
3. Does the marking conform to the verified assessment criteria (based on the sample scripts)?			
4. Are the marking decisions consistent (based on the sample scripts)?			
5. Are there any recurring themes, patterns, discrepancies (based on the sample scripts)?			
6. In case of written work that is based on critical analysis, grading was found fair and consistent?			

7. *The student samples indicated the complexity required in line with NQF mapped level?*			
8. *Is there any ILOs did not attain 60% out of the assessment?*			
9. *In case of any ILO is unattained is there any action taken to support attainment the ILO in the upcoming courses to be offered?*			
10. *There is an appropriate distribution of grades across the class size*			
11. *Average class marks are within the norms for the level of the course within the College and the University as a whole*			

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

Name of Chairperson of Internal Moderation Committee		Signature		Date	

Form: Internal Verification and Moderation Summary Report

(To be submitted to the Dean of the College by the Chairperson/Programme Coordinator)

Department		College	
Name of the program		Academic Year	
Number of Courses		**Semester (please Tick)**					

		First		Second		Summer

In case of more than one major piece of work, please indicate the number of assessments conducted

Course Code	Course Syllabus verified?	Major Piece of work verified?	Final Exam verified?	Internal Moderation Conducted	External Moderation Conducted	Remarks

Name of Chairperson/Programme Coordinator		**Signature**		**Date**	
Name of the Dean		**Signature**		**Date**	

External Assessor Form (1)
Report on Verification and Overall Matters
(Cross Border Qualifications)

Course Code		Course Title	
Department		College	
Number of sections		Academic Year	

Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor		Semester (please Tick)				
		First		Second		Summer

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

Comments of External Assessor/Examiner

Verification of Assessment

Specific questions	Remarks
Major piece of course work	
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. Was the time allocated for this course work appropriate for the answers required	
5. Does the assessment assess the complexity required in line with NQF mapped level?	
6. Does the assessment covers contextual based materials ?	
Final examination	
7. Is there a clear link between the final examination and the programme aims/intended learning outcomes (ILOs)?	
8. Are the allocated ILOs within the course syllabus and specifications clearly demonstrated within the proposed final examination questions?	

9.	Does assessment aligns with the awarding body policies and procedures and conforms with local regulatory requirements ?	

External Assessor Form (1)
Report on Verification and Overall Matters
(Cross Border Qualifications)

Course Code		Course Title	
Department		College	
Number of sections		Academic Year	
Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor		Semester (please Tick)	

	First		Second		Summer

Type of examination (e.g. written or practical)	
Comments of External Assessor/Examiner	
Verification of Assessment	

Final examination (CONT'D)	
10. Are the assessment methods and criteria used fair and valid to assess the level of the course?	
11. Does the final examination cover all the required areas	
12. Was the duration of the exam fair for the areas to be assessed?	
13. The final exam assessed the complexity required to the mapped NQF level?	
1b Other comments on verification of assessment	
2 General Comments	

Name of External Examiner/Assessor		**Signature**		**Date**	

Please return this form to the Chairperson – thank you

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

Course Code		Course Title	
Department		College	
Number of sections		Academic Year	

Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor		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)*				
1 Specific questions	**Yes**	**No**	**Remarks**	
Major piece of course work				
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)?*				

6. *Feedback on the assessment was provided and was found sufficient to inform student progression*			
Final examination			
There is a full list of marks awarded to all students for the final examination			

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

Course Code		Course Title	
Department		College	
Number of sections		Academic Year	

Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor		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)*				
	Yes	No	Remarks	
Final examination (CONT'D)				
6. There is a full list of marks awarded to all student assessments for the course				
7. Does the internal marking conform to the marking scheme (based on the sample scripts)?				
8. Does the internal marking conform to the verified assessment criteria (based on the sample scripts)?				
9. Are the internal marking decisions consistent and fair (based on the sample scripts)?				
10. Are there any recurring themes, patterns, discrepancies (based on the sample scripts)?				
Overall Grade Distribution				
11. The ILOs achievement matrix reflected a fair distribution of grades and overall ILOs attainment rate?				

12. There is a fair distribution of the grades within the overall class			

2 General comments

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

Course Code		Course Title	
Department		College	
Number of sections		Academic Year	

Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor		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)*	

Concerns	
Have any concerns been resolved with the chairperson and Course Coordinator/Instructor	

If yes, what actions have been taken?	

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

Course Code		Course Title	
Department		College	
Number of sections		Academic Year	

Name of Coordinator or Course Instructor		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)*	

Name of External Examiner/Assessor	
Signature	
Date	

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)**
First Major Piece of Work (** if applicable)			
1			
2			
3			
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)**
Second Major Piece of Work (** if applicable)			
1			
2			
3			

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)**
Third Major Piece of Work (** if applicable)			
1			
2			
3			

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)**
Final Examination			
1			
2			
3			

Generic rubric for Class/Oral Participation

Element	Fail (<59%) to D (60-66%)	C (67-76%) to B (77-	A (87-100%)
Attendance	Has missed >15% of classes but less than threshold for "W"	Has missed 5-15% of classes	Near perfect attendance record
Frequency of participation	Does not participate in, or alternatively dominates class discussions	Occasionally participates in class discussions or practical/clinical sessions.	Regularly participates in class discussions or practical/clinical sessions. Initiates questions.
Respect	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
Inclusiveness	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.
Relevance and insight	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.
Terminology and vocabulary	Little or no attempt to use terminology and/or vocabulary in conversation.	Mispronounced, misused and/or sporadic use of terminology	Relevant and fluent terminology and/or vocabulary and pronunciation
Critical thinking	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 behaviors 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 student in health professional's ability to integrate and apply clinical, professional communication and practical skills appropriate for their respective specialization.

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 of 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
Knowledge &Understanding	A1	Theory and concepts	Lecturing, Class discussions, Independent Learning, E-learning	Closed book examinations (mid-terms, finals), quizzes, oral enquiry, graded homework	Knowledge: Theoretical Understanding
	A2	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
	A3	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
Subject Specific Skills	B1	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
	B2	Modeling and design	In class /lab supervised work, computer aided design/modeling, simulation	projects, in-lab exercises	Knowledge: Practical Application

	B3	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
Critical Thinking Skills	C1	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
	C2	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
	C3	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
General Transferable Skills	D1	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
	D2	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

	D3	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
	D4	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 sub strands but additional sub strands may apply. ** For ILO C2, strategic thinking is more appropriate for master's level courses, whilst synthetic skills are more appropriate for undergraduate level*

Appendix 1 – Course Syllabus/ Specification Template – Merged with NQF Mapping

COLLEGE OF --

DEPARTMENT OF ……………………………………

<u>**COURSE SYLLABUS/ SPECIFICATION**</u>

Course Code & Title:

Weight:

Prerequisite:

NQF Level Allocated: **NQF Notional Hours / Credits:**

Description:

Objective:

Semester:

Instructor (s):

Office Telephone: **Email (s):**

Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs):

A. Knowledge and Understanding		NQF Descriptor/ Level
A1	Concepts and Theories:	
A2	Contemporary Trends, Problems and Research:	
A3	Professional Responsibility:	

B. Subject-specific Skills		NQF Descriptor/ Level
B1	Problem Solving:	
B2	Modeling and Design:	
B3	Application of Methods and Tools:	

C. Critical-Thinking Skills		NQF Descriptor/ Level
C1	Analytic skills:	
C2	Synthetic:	
C3	Creative Thinking and innovation:	

D. General and Transferable Skills (other skills relevant to employability and personal development)		NQF Descriptor/ Level
D1	Communication	
D2	Teamwork and Leadership:	

D3	Organizational and Developmental Skills:	
D4	Ethics and Social Responsibility:	

Course Structure (Outline)

Week	Hours	ILOs	Topics	Teaching Method	Assessment Method
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					

* Formative assessment

Teaching Materials:

Textbook(s):	
Handout(s):	
Reference(s):	

Assessment

Method of Assessment	Description	Learning Outcomes	Weighting
Overall:			**100 %**

Admissions	
Pre-requisites	
Minimum number of students	
Maximum number of students	

Appendix 2 – National Qualification Framework Level Descriptors