

## Faculty of Humanities Grading Policy

1. Grading must adhere to the following Senate regulations as articulated in the [graduate](#) and [undergraduate](#) sections of the Calendar. All Humanities course outlines must include the following:
  - a) an up-to-date link to the applicable Calendar grading policy;
  - b) a link to this policy; and
  - c) the following statement: *Grades are not official until they have been approved by the Chair, Director, or designate.*
2. The Calendar prohibits bell curving (that is, “assign[ing] a predetermined percentage of students a specific grade”).
3. Instructors must adhere to the grade descriptions in the Calendar. For example, for undergraduates, A-range grades must be assigned only for work that is technically superior, shows mastery of the subject matter, and in the case of an A+ offers original insight and/or goes beyond course expectations. For graduate students, A+ work must be technically flawless and often publishable.
4. In commenting on students’ work, instructors must match keywords to the associated grade ranges: for example, for undergraduates, good is a keyword associated with B-range grades.
5. In undergraduate classes, A-range grades are “normally achieved by a minority of [undergraduate] students” (emphasis added).
6. At graduate level, a grade of B- or lower will be reviewed by the student’s supervisory committee and a recommendation made to the Dean of Graduate Studies.
7. Grading must be an unbiased process. For example, if a student hands in an excellent essay that you suspect might have been plagiarized but you decide you have no grounds for an investigation, you must dismiss the suspicion from your mind while marking the paper.
8. All grades, including those for participation, must be reviewable and based on transparent criteria. Participation grades, for example, might be ranked on a scale of 1 to 5 based on coming to class, being prepared for class, and contributing to class activities. In such a system, the instructor must have records of attendance, preparation, and contribution. Grades based on attendance or assignment completion alone are discouraged because they may lead to grade inflation.
9. Assessment design must permit a full range of student performance, normally including the ability to show performance beyond course expectations, as required by the A+ grade description.
10. Alternative assessment design (for example, labour-based grading or un-grading) is permissible if it adheres to the Calendar and this policy.

11. In approving grades, Chairs and Directors will consider principles of fairness and consistency across sections of the same course, across the unit and across the faculty.
12. When grades submitted for review appear to be inconsistent with the Calendar or this policy, the Chair, Director, or designate will discuss the grades with the instructor. If, after discussion with the instructor, the Chair concludes that the grades are inconsistent with policy, they will not approve grades but will return the grades to the instructor for adjustment. In extraordinary circumstances, the Chair or Director will arrange for an appropriately qualified instructor to regrade assignments and amend the assigned grades.
13. Grades will normally be submitted no more than seven calendar days past the date of the final examination or the due date of the final assignment (whichever is latest).
14. Grades must be submitted by the final grading deadline for the term (which, for instructors with exams in the last days of the exam period, may fall within seven days of the last exam; see above).
15. If a teaching assistant is unable to meet the grading deadline, the instructor is responsible for completing the grading (and may request support from the unit).
16. Every year, the dean will provide Chairs and Directors with the grading report for the university and review grading trends in the Faculty; Chairs and Directors will provide instructors with the grading report for the Faculty and review grading trends in the unit.

### **Late Submission of Grades**

If an instructor fails to meet the final grading deadline, the Chair or Director will follow these steps:

1. If the instructor is unable to meet the final deadline for the entire class but able to submit all grades within a few days after it, grades for graduating students will be prioritized and be submitted on an [auxiliary grade sheet](#) by the grading deadline. The instructor will inform the Chair or Director of the delay and will agree with the Chair or Director on a date within one week by which all grading will be complete.
2. If an instructor is unable (for example, because of a medical emergency) to meet the final grading deadline, the instructor will inform the Chair or Director as soon as possible and hand over all materials to enable a qualified instructor to complete the grading and submit the grades.
3. If the instructor is able to complete the grading but has not done so by one week past the final grading deadline, the Chair or Director will report the matter to the

Dean as a personnel issue. The Chair or Director, in consultation with the Dean, may hand over all materials to enable a qualified instructor to complete the grading and submit the grades.

In each case, the Chair or Director will inform the Office of the Registrar and Enrollment Management and the Dean of the delay, the plan to get the grading done, and the date at which the grades will be submitted.