

FACULTY OF HUMAN AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF ASSIGNED GRADES

1. Any student wishing clarification about, or who is dissatisfied with, an assigned grade, either for a whole course or a portion of it, shall first discuss the matter with the instructor, who will review the work in question. This discussion normally should take place within 14 days of the grades being available for the portion of the course that is in question. If the instructor agrees to change a grade before the final course grades have been submitted, no further action is required. If, however, the course grades have been submitted, a change of grade request should be made through the Director to Records Services in the normal way.
2. If the review by the instructor confirms the original grade, and if the student is still dissatisfied, then the student can appeal to the Director of the School in writing, stating clearly the grounds on which the student believes the grade should be raised. If the Director believes the grounds to be reasonable, then the *student will formally request a review of grade through Records Services*, and the Director shall initiate a review of the grade using the procedures below. If the Director does not agree *with the need for* a review of the grade, the student has the right to formally request a review of grade through Records Services, as set out in the Calendar.
3. In a review of a grade, the following procedures shall be used:
 - 3.1 The student requesting the grade review shall sign a consent form indicating that the student understands that the grade may be raised, lowered or remain the same. Alternatively, the Director may write a letter back to the student indicating that the grade assigned by a second instructor will be the final grade and that the grade may be raised, lowered or remain the same.
 - 3.2 The Director will appoint a second instructor (preferably an experienced faculty member who has recently taught the course or one closely related to it) to review the grade assigned. If the instructor of the course for which the grade is questioned is the Director, then a senior member of the unit will be appointed to handle the appeal.
 - 3.3 The original instructor shall provide:
 - (a) a course outline.
 - (b) a description of the assignment(s) in question, if not included in the course outline.
 - (c) an explicit statement on how the grade was determined and what assessment techniques were used.
 - (d) scoring keys or a marking guide or explicit criteria for evaluating the components of the grade.
 - (e) the distribution of the marks and of the grades for the course (or component in question).

- (f) if possible, a representative sample of graded papers from the course.
- 3.4 The reviewer should read clean, unmarked copies of all the written work submitted for the grade in question. Examination copies may have to be obtained from Records Services, and identifying information removed. Students do not have the option to rewrite, edit or in any other way change their papers prior to the review process. If there is any question regarding the version of a paper submitted for review, the student will be asked to submit the original paper.
 - 3.5 The reviewer shall be provided with the items detailed in 3.3 and 3.4. The reviewer is expected to come to a final mark without consultation with the original marker.
 - 3.6 Where possible, the reviewer and the student should not be identified (i.e., name, student number) to minimize risk of bias. The reviewer shall then submit to the Director (or the person appointed to handle the appeal in 3.2 above) an independent evaluation of the grade.
4. If the evaluation is different from that of the initial instructor, then the Director may consult (if necessary) with both instructors and/or seek further opinion before deciding the final grade to be awarded. This revised grade shall be recorded as the official grade regardless of whether it is lower, the same or higher than the original grade.