



ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE

Governing Policy

Assessment Policy

Purpose

This procedure sets out guidelines and details of operationalising the Assessment Policy.

Definitions

Unless otherwise defined in this document, all capitalised terms are defined in the [glossary](#).

Procedure

1. Assessment Design

- 1.1. Assessment in a subject is designed to enable students to demonstrate their level of achievement for subject and course learning outcomes and AIB's Graduate Qualities.
- 1.2. Learning outcomes for different subjects and courses reflect the relative complexity of the knowledge base and the depth of achievement required at different levels and the assessment design will reference and reflect those distinctions.
- 1.3. Assessment items comprise three items of assessment per subject (with the exception of the Project):

Assessment item	Weighting
Formative or short summative assessment (quizzes, forum posts, reflective piece etc)	10-15%
Interim summative assessment (report, essay etc)	35-40%
Authentic Assessment (capstone)	50-55%
Project	
Proposal	15-20%
Final assignment (4500 words)	80-85%

- 1.4. The first assessment must be submitted and assessed prior to the Census Date. This provides students with formative feedback in a 'low risk' situation, i.e. not jeopardizing their final grade, while facilitating development. This component may include quizzes or forum posts.

- 1.5. Assessment in each subject within the course must comprise at least 50% authentic assessment, meeting the AIB definition of Authentic Assessment.
- 1.6. Assessments should comprise an appropriate mix of assignment tasks which include projects, reports, presentations, forum posts, reflective pieces, time-bound tests, quizzes, oral presentations and measurements of student engagement.
- 1.7. Assessment diversity must be mapped across the whole course to ensure appropriate skill development, timing, sequencing, weighting, authenticity profile, and mix of assessments. This will ensure that across the degree the balance of assessment design is appropriate.

2. Information for Students

- 2.1. Details about each assessment item and the weighting for each assessment item in any given subject, including the due dates, word limits (if applicable), marking criteria and feedback format (i.e. written or oral) must be set out in the subject outline provided for the subject and must be available to students at least two weeks before subject commencement.
- 2.2. Students must comply with the writing conventions set out in the AIB Style Guide which is available at the [Student Learning Portal](#). Assignment exemplars may be provided in Webinars by the Subject Coordinator or Online Facilitator.
- 2.3. The final assessment item in each subject will require students to explicitly link subject content and theory with their professional context and experience, or a scenario-based simulation.

3. Due dates, extensions and assignment submission

- 3.1. Students must submit the assessment items for each subject on the due date stipulated in the relevant Subject Outline. If students require an extension for submission of an assessment item, a written request together with supporting documentation and the reason for the request must be forwarded to AIB prior to the submission due date. The extension may be granted at the sole discretion of AIB.
- 3.2. If no extension has been requested and granted and the assessment item is received by AIB after the due date (from either the student or the Teaching Centre¹):
 - (a) a penalty of 10% of the maximum mark available for the assessment item will be applied for each day overdue, to a maximum of 5 calendar days from the assessment due date at which point the assignment will not be accepted.
 - (b) students with exceptional circumstances will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

¹ Please note that procedures relating to Teaching Centres are as per current teaching out period; these procedures cease on 1 November 2019.

4. Academic Integrity

- 4.1. If students have plagiarised in an assessment or otherwise breached the Academic Integrity policy, penalties will apply according to the Academic Integrity Policy. Remark requests for assessment items that have been found to be in breach of the Academic Integrity policy will not be accepted. Refer to the policy on Academic Integrity for more details.
- 4.2. To support the academic integrity of AIB's assessment, a random selection of submitted assignments in each Term may require students to present a verbal summary of the assignment and respond to several questions. The student must verbally demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the submitted assignment to validate that the work is their own. This information must be included in all Subject Outline.

5. Accommodation of Special Needs in Assessments

- 5.1. A student with a disability, impairment or medical condition who seeks reasonable adjustments in their study or assessment methods because of that condition may make a request:
 - (a) in the case of a pre-existing condition, in the 'special needs' section of the application form; or
 - (b) in the case of a condition occurring during the course of study, in writing to the Student Central department (during the course of study).
- 5.2. If approved by the Academic Dean, any such reasonable adjustments will be confirmed in writing.

6. Moderation of Assessment

- 6.1. For subjects with more than one facilitator or marker, the subject coordinator is responsible for Moderation of Assessment. Marking guides and/or rubrics must be provided for all assessments and must be applied by all markers to enhance the consistency of marking and quality of feedback. Rubrics must be made available to students in the Subject Outline two weeks before subject commencement, to inform their assignment preparation and communicate the expectations of the teaching team regarding the focus and relative emphases in the assessment. In addition, sample marking and comparison of assessment results across classes within a subject takes place before finalising results.
- 6.2. External moderation of AIB's assessments is undertaken through a formal peer review process occurring on a regular basis, as specified in the Course and Subject Review Policy.

7. Marking Scale

- 7.1. The following marking scale will apply for each subject:

0 - 49	Fail
50 - 54	P2
55 - 64	P1
65 - 74	Credit
75 - 84	Distinction
85 - 100	High Distinction

- 7.2. **'E'** means 'Exemption granted' and appears in the Academic Transcript if a student has been granted one or more subject exemptions (via Credit Transfer or Recognition of Prior Learning) or AIB has acknowledged an articulation arrangement.
- 7.3. **'IC'** means 'Incomplete' in that the student is yet to complete all of the requirements of the subject. This is not considered to be a final grade or final notation and hence does not appear in the Academic Transcript.
- 7.4. **'WNF'** means 'Withdraw Not Fail' and appears in the Academic Transcript if a student has correctly withdrawn from a subject on or before the census date. This is not equivalent to a fail.
- 7.5. **'WF'** means 'Withdraw Fail' and appears in the Academic Transcript if a student has withdrawn from a subject after the census date. This is equivalent to a fail.
- 7.6. **'MC'** means 'Medical/Compassionate' and appears in the Academic Transcript if a student has requested and been granted a deferral for a subject on medical/compassionate grounds. This is not equivalent to a fail. If Special Circumstances has been granted for a subject, no grade will appear in the Academic Transcript in relation to that subject.
- 7.7. **'DNS'** means 'Did Not Sit or Submit'.

Prior to May 2018: DNS appears in the Academic Transcript if a student has enrolled in a subject but did not sit or submit the final assessment item (including examination, assignment or project) AND the student was not awarded a withdrawal or medical/compassionate or Special Circumstances. This is equivalent to a fail.

From May 2018: DNS appears in the Academic Transcript if a student has enrolled in a subject but did not submit or sit any of the assessment items AND was not awarded a WF, WNF or MC. This is equivalent to a fail.

- 7.8. **'NGP'** means 'Non-Graded Pass' and appears in the Academic Transcript when AIB in its discretion decides to award a non-graded pass.
- 7.9. All fail marks/grades will appear on the Academic Transcript. The Academic Transcript will also include a Grade Point Average (refer to policy on Calculation of Grade Point Average).

8. Explanation of Grading System

- 8.1. The characteristics of the various assessment grades are described in the table below.

The table provides a guideline which, in general terms, identifies the standard of work expected for each grade; however the specific assessment criteria for the assessment, as defined in specific rubrics for each subject, will always take precedence. The final grade will take into account the performance against all the

criteria. Typically, higher grades will be awarded only when work meets the descriptor of that grade in substantially all of the criteria. It should be noted that the expected level of performance is different depending on the AQF level of the subject.

	HD	D	C	P1 and P2	F
	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Fail
General description	Very high standard of work demonstrating creativity and originality.	High standard of work demonstrating originality and insight.	Reasonably high level of work with some originality and insight.	Satisfies minimum requirements.	Fails to satisfy minimum requirements.
Knowledge of principles and concepts	Insight and awareness of deeper aspects of topic; understanding well beyond required knowledge base.	Awareness of deeper aspects of topic.	Sound knowledge of principles and concepts.	Adequate knowledge of principles and concepts.	Scant knowledge of principles and concepts.
Application of knowledge	Excellent examples and application; clearly explained and justified.	Significant examples and application; explained and justified.	Appropriate examples and application.	Some examples and application; some attempt at explanation and justification.	Very little evidence of examples or application; inadequately explained and poorly justified.
Analysis and evaluation	Highly developed analytical and evaluation skills. Demonstrating critical reflection. Clearly articulated argument throughout.	Well-developed analytical and evaluation skills. Demonstrating some critical reflection.	Appropriate use of fundamental analysis and evaluation skills.	Some evidence of analytical and evaluation skills.	Very little evidence of analytical and evaluation skills.
Use of readings and materials	Evidence of broad independent reading beyond core learning materials.	Evidence of reading beyond core learning materials.	Good understanding of core learning materials and some evidence of further reading.	Evidence of having read core learning materials.	Very little evidence of having read core learning materials.

Communication, presentation, referencing	Highly developed communication, presentation and referencing skills.	Well-developed communication, presentation and referencing skills.	Good communication, presentation and referencing skills. Accurate and consistent acknowledgment of sources.	Adequate communication, presentation and referencing skills.	Rudimentary communication and presentation skills. Inaccurate and/or inconsistent acknowledgement of sources.
---	--	--	---	--	---

9. Finalising and Recording of Assessment Grades

- 9.1. The final marks/grades are an aggregate of the marks/grades for the various assessment items.
- 9.2. Final marks/grades and notations for subjects will not be deemed official until after Moderation of Assessment marks/grades by subject coordinators and after formal review by the Examination Committee.
- 9.3. Final marks/grades are formally recorded. Final marks/grades and final notations can only be altered with the approval of the Academic Dean.

10. Review of Marks for, and Re-Marking of, Assessments

10.1. Failing an assignment and/or subject

All references to assignments shall be deemed to include projects, reports and all other similar pieces of assessment.

- (a) If a student fails an assignment, they may:
 - (i) obtain informal feedback from an academic staff member;
 - (ii) appeal for a re-mark (see section 10.3);
 - (iii) re-enrol in the subject and pay the relevant fees.
- (b) Resubmission of an assignment is not normally permitted and will be considered only if all of the following requirements are met, at the discretion of the Academic Dean:
 - Final offerings of teach-out subjects, or
 - The assessment item is a final assignment in the Project in the MBA; and
 - The final or overall mark for the subject is between 45% and 49% inclusive; and
 - The mark for the final assignment is 45% or higher; and
 - The student has made a genuine attempt at all other assessment items in the subject.
 - In the event of resubmission, marks will be capped at 50% for the assessment item.
 - Only one resubmission per subject enrolment will be allowed.

10.2. High Level Feedback

Students are entitled to request high level feedback from the Subject Coordinator on their assessments within 60 calendar days from the end date of the relevant term.

10.3. Re-mark

- (a) Students are entitled to formally request a re-mark for an assessment within 14 calendar days of AIB's release of the assessment grade. If a request (accompanied by a re-marking fee) is not made within this time, AIB will not conduct the re-mark. Any fees paid after the cut-off date will be held in credit in accordance with the fees in credit policy.
- (b) Any formal re-mark request must be made in writing in the required form, specified in the relevant student handbook, and must include evidence why the student believes the mark/grade was wrong or unfair. The Head of Discipline will determine if a re-mark is justified or not. If not, the student will be advised of the decision within five working days of receipt of the re-mark request. The Head of Discipline may determine whether re-marking is not justified in various circumstances including, but not limited to, plagiarism or breach of the Academic Integrity policy.
- (c) If the Head of Discipline allows the re-marking, independent re-marking by a person other than the original assessor ("the re-marker") shall be arranged. The re-marker may be from AIB or from another institution, but must have expertise in the area related to the assessment. The re-marker must use their best endeavours to ensure that the re-marking is as independent as possible, and will be given:
 - (i) all relevant documentation about the assessment in question, which may include but is not limited to a description of the subject, the assessment question, assessment criteria, solutions guide and any available information about standards expected for each range of marks; and
 - (ii) a clean copy of the student's work, where possible.

At this stage, the re-marker will not normally be given details of the student's original assessment, including the marks.

- (d) Only the re-marked assessment mark/grade will be provided, not any breakdown of marks/grades or feedback.
- (e) Only one re-mark for each assessment will be permitted. The re-marked mark/grade will be the final mark/grade, whether it is higher or lower than the original mark/grade.
- (f) The re-mark fee may be refunded to the student if
 - (i) the re-marked assessment mark is 10% or more than the original assessment mark, and
 - (ii) the overall subject grade increases.

Fee Help Eligible Students are required to pay the relevant re-marking fees, except for assessments they have failed.

11. Appeal

Students dissatisfied after following the re-marking process referred to above, can submit a formal appeal/grievance in accordance with stage one as referred to in the Academic and Non-Academic Grievance Handling Policy and Procedure. Students should note that such an appeal may only be on the grounds that correct policies and procedures were not followed in carrying out the re-marking process (and the review of the appeal will not include a review of the assessment or subject mark/grade).

Related Forms and Documents:

Formal Request of Re-Mark Form
Subject Outline
AIB Style Guide

Responsibility:

Academic Dean

Current Status:	Version 1
Approved By:	Academic Board
Date of Approval:	12 April 2019
Effective from:	Term 5, 2019
Previous version:	27 June 2018 (Assessment Policy, V12)
Date of Next Review:	12 April 2022