	THE SHERIDAN COLLEGE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AND ADVANCED LEARNING

Sheridan

STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Date of Approval: December 10, 2014	**Mandatory Review Date:** May 2018	**Approved By:** Provost and Vice-President, Academic
Effective Date: September 2017 (start of term)		

1 Purpose

The intent of this procedure is to support all students learning by applying fair and consistent assessment and evaluation practices. Best practices were used to develop the Student Assessment and Evaluation Policy and Procedure.

2 Scope

All professors (as defined below), Instructors (as defined below) and Co-op advisers, Career Education, and Student Services personnel (as defined below) are required to follow the Procedure of the Assessment and Evaluation Policy. This Procedure applies to the assessment and evaluation of student performance in academic programming (Certificate, Diploma, Advanced Diploma, Degree, Post-Graduate Certificate and Board Approved Certificate credentials) within all Academic Faculties at Sheridan.

Academic Faculties may develop additional procedures according to unique program needs/program outcomes. These Faculty-level procedures must comply with this Procedure and its associated Policy. Local Faculty-level procedures are subject to the approval of the Faculty's Local Academic Council (LAC). If there are discrepancies between the Faculty LAC Procedures and this Procedure, the Dean is responsible for resolving the discrepancy.

3 Definitions

Assessment: means providing ongoing feedback to students about their progress and development relying on methods and strategies that do not include a numeric or letter grade.

Formative: means assessment that takes place during instruction in order to provide direction for improvement to individual students and in order to make adjustments to

instructional programs. The information gathered is used for the specific purpose of helping students improve while they are still gaining knowledge and practising skills.[1]

Evaluation: means the determination of the quality of work based upon defined criteria (e.g. rubric, grading scheme). Evaluation is usually communicated using a numeric and/or alpha grade.

> **Summative:** Evaluation that occurs at the end of important segments of student learning. It is used to summarize and communicate what students know and can do with respect to curriculum expectations.[2]

Professors: include full-time, partial-load, part-time and sessional faculty members.

Instructor: is responsible for the assessment and evaluation of students within an assigned course.

Co-op Adviser, Career Education and Student Services Personnel: are responsible for assessment and evaluation of students within an assigned course.

Evaluation Plan: is a description of how learning will be evaluated. The evaluation plan is listed in the course outline. It identifies each evaluation with a clear statement of what percentage of the final grade each evaluation will represent.

Evaluation Practices: are descriptions of evaluations, such as how grades are determined (e.g. rubric), penalties for missed due dates, missed tests or exams etc.

Feedback: is information provided by a professor to a student regarding aspects of their performance or understanding for the purpose of improving learning and achievement (Evans, 2013).

Mark: is awarded for each individual evaluation within the course; each mark contributes to the final grade.

Program: is a group of related courses leading to an academic credential awarded by the Board of Governors (Minister's Binding Policy Directive, 2009).

Faculty: is a Sheridan academic unit comprised of a number of related programs.

---

1   "Growing Success document" retrieved from: http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/policyfunding/success.html

2   "Growing Success document" retrieved from: http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/policyfunding/success.html

4 Procedure

The purpose of assessment and evaluation is to improve student learning and to document academic progress via grades. Learning should be assessed and evaluated throughout the course.

4.1 Assessment

4.1.1 Assessments should be used throughout the course to provide ongoing feedback to students about their progress and development.

4.2 Evaluation Plans

4.2.1 Professors and/or Local Academic Councils will ensure that the methods of evaluation in a course are appropriately varied, are in alignment with learning outcomes, and measure course learning outcomes.

4.2.2 Evaluations must be distributed throughout the course.

4.2.3 Evaluation plans must include a breakdown showing percentages attributed to each individual evaluation (e.g. 4 tests @10% = 40%).

4.2.4 No single evaluation shall count for more than 50% of a student's final grade.

4.2.5 Attendance must not be part of evaluation unless it is linked to program/course learning outcomes.

4.2.6 Evaluation plans, evaluation practices and methods used to calculate final grades, must be consistent across all sections of the course.

4.2.7 Evaluation plans and evaluation practices must be reviewed with the students within the first two weeks of the course.

4.2.8 The evaluation plan must not change during the course without the agreement of the Associate Dean and acknowledgement of all students in all sections.

4.2.9 Professors must communicate the evaluation criteria to students (e.g. rubrics and/or instructions for presentations, critiques, assignments, performances, skills based testing) in advance of the evaluation.

4.2.10 The final grade calculation must reflect the evaluation plan in the course outline.

4.2.11 Sheridan administration (Dean or designate) reserves the right to change the evaluation plan for any or all courses in extraordinary circumstances (e.g. labour disruption, emergency situation).

4.3 Timely Feedback

4.3.1   When students are aware of their progress early in a course they can make informed decisions. Therefore,

> 4.3.1.1. Feedback from evaluations should be returned to the student in a reasonable time to provide students with the opportunity to improve. Each program should establish timelines for providing feedback.

> 4.3.1.2. All students must receive feedback regarding their progress prior to the final date by which a student can drop the course without academic penalty to assist in that decision.

4.4 Academic Missed Work according to the Evaluation Plan

4.4.1   Consequences for academic missed work must be applied in a way to reinforce and encourage learning and expectations of performance.

4.4.2   Each Program will establish and publish its "Academic Missed Work Procedure" that describes practices for extensions, late penalties and missed work. The Procedure or location of the Procedure will be published in the course outline. Samples of Academic Missed Work Procedures can be found on the Centre for Teaching and Learning website.

4.4.3   Policies, practices and penalties for academic missed work must be applied consistently across a Program.

4.4.4   Graduated consequences are to be applied. Failure to hand in an assignment on the due date cannot result in an immediate "zero" or "no grade" where a legitimate reason is provided with supporting documentation.

4.4.5   Examples of "legitimate reasons" are identified by the Faculty, communicated to students, and must be applied consistently across all Programs in that Faculty.

4.5 Marking Concerns Raised by Students

In the event a student has a marking concern for an individual evaluation within a course, the student must have a discussion with the faculty member. In the attempt to resolve the concern, other solutions that may be considered are at the discretion of the faculty member. Examples include but are not limited to:

- Recalculation of the mark
- Extension on course work with/without late penalty
- Rewrite/resubmit course work with/without late penalty
- Completion of a supplementary assignment or project
- Reassessment/reread of course work by the faculty member

If a student feels their concern remains unresolved or has not been satisfactorily resolved, they may consult their Associate Dean or designate for advice and assistance. Such consultation will not place the Associate Dean in a conflict of interest in the event of an academic appeal.

5   Related Documentation/Links/Forms

Centre for Teaching and Learning is available to facilitate discussions related to Assessment and Evaluation Practices.

Student Assessment and Evaluation Policy
Academic Integrity Policy
Academic Integrity Procedure
Academic Appeals and Consideration Policy
Academic Appeals and Consideration Procedure
Academic Standing Policy
Free Speech Policy

References

Evans, C. (2013). Making Sense of Assessment Feedback in Higher Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(1), 70-120.

Ministers Binding Policy Directive on Framework for Programs of Instruction, 2009

Ontario Qualifications Framework (http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/programs/oqf/)