

Title: Inter-Assessment Discrepancy Evaluation Policy

Code: AQP_05(1)

Inter-Assessment Discrepancy Evaluation Policy

Purpose

This policy ensures a systematic and fair approach to evaluating and resolving discrepancies in student performance across multiple assessments. It aims to maintain academic integrity and consistency in grading.

Scope

This policy applies to all assessments, including exams, assignments, quizzes, projects, and practical evaluations, conducted at KKUCOD. It is relevant when:

- There is a substantial discrepancy between scores given by different evaluators for the same assessment.
- A student formally requests a review due to perceived inconsistency.

Definition of Assessment Discrepancy

Assessment discrepancies may include:

- **Performance Discrepancy:** A significant gap in a student's performance across related assessments (e.g., scoring consistently low on exams but excelling in assignments).
- **Grading Inconsistency:** Differences in marks awarded by multiple evaluators for similar responses.
- **Error in Scoring:** Errors in calculation, transcription, or application of grading rubrics.

Identification of Discrepancies

Discrepancies may be identified through:

1. Routine grading reviews by course coordinators.
2. Requests from students via a formal discrepancy review application.
3. Observation by faculty staff during moderation or quality assurance checks.

Evaluation Process

Submission of Discrepancy Review Request

- Students must submit a written request for evaluation within 7 days of receiving the grade.
- The request should include:
 - Course name and assessment details.
 - A detailed explanation of the perceived discrepancy.
 - Any supporting evidence (e.g., drafts, course coordinator feedback).

Initial Review

The course coordinator will perform an initial review to:

- Reassess the student's work using the original grading criteria.
- Verify the accuracy of score calculations and rubric application.
- Check for consistency in grading across other students' assessments.
- If necessary, a secondary evaluator (member of the course committee member) will independently review the assessment to ensure objectivity.

Inter-Evaluator Discrepancy

In the event of an inter-evaluator discrepancy exceeding 25% of the total mark during a student's evaluation, a third evaluator will be appointed to reassess the student. This third evaluator will be either the course coordinator or a designated member of the course committee. Their evaluation will serve as the final decision to ensure fairness and consistency in the grading process.

Resolution Outcomes

Based on the findings, the following actions may be taken:

1. **Grade Adjustment:** The grade is revised to reflect accurate evaluation.
2. **Supplementary Assessment:** The student is offered an additional opportunity to demonstrate competence.
3. **No Change:** If the evaluation confirms that the original grade is accurate, no changes will

Communication of Decision

- The final decision will be communicated to the student in writing within 7 days of the review request.
- The communication will include:
 - An explanation of the findings.
 - The outcome and any further steps (if applicable).

Responsibilities

- **Students:** Submit requests for review promptly and provide accurate supporting documentation.
- **Course Coordinators:** Apply grading rubrics consistently and conduct thorough reviews of discrepancies.
- **Academic Office:** Ensure adherence to the policy and oversee the resolution process.

Periodic Review

This policy will be reviewed regularly to ensure it aligns with best practices in academic assessment and institutional objectives.

Table of Revisions

Version number	Approved by	Date of Revision