



ASSESSMENT POLICY

For Teacher Education Programmes

Document Title	Assessment Policy
Owner	MIE
Approved by	Council
Version	1
Effective Date	
Review Cycle	
Next Review Date	

Contents

1.0 Policy Scope.....	3
2.0 Policy Statement	3
3.0 Programmes Levels and Qualifications Framework	3
4.0 Equality and Diversity Statement	4
4.1 Inclusive Assessment Design	4
5.0 Assessment and Feedback in Teacher Education	4
5.1 Constructive Alignment	4
5.2 Authentic Assessment	4
6.0 Assessment and Feedback Guiding Principles	5
6.1 Guiding Practices.....	5
Accessibility, Fairness and Transparency	5
6.2 Validity, Reliability and Consistency	5
6.3 Student Partnership in Assessment	5
7.0 Formative Feedback	6
8.0 Summative Assessment	6
8.1 Summative Assessment Requirements.....	6
8.2 Summative Feedback.....	6
8.3 Assessment Weightage and Pass Mark	6
9.0 Coursework and Continuous Assessment.....	6
9.1 Word Count.....	7
9.2 Group Work (Summative Assessment).....	7
9.3 Extensions and Late Submission	8
9.4 Attendance Requirements	8
9.5 Submission and Plagiarism	8
10.0 Examinations.....	8
10.1 Setting an Examination	8
10.2 Attendance, Absence, and Admission to Examination	9
10.3 Deferral of Examination.....	9
10.4 Invigilation and Academic Integrity	9
11.0 Teaching Practice / School-Based Experience.....	9
12.0 E-Assessment.....	9
13.0 Assessment Criteria and Rubrics	9
14.0 Marking and Moderation.....	10
15.0 Academic Misconduct	10
15.1 Academic Integrity and Misconduct	10
16.0 Final Marks, Grading, and Results	11
16.1 Grading Scale.....	11
16.2 Ratification and Declaration of Results	11
16.3 Appeal.....	12

16.4 Re-Sit	12
16.5 Assessment Data and Quality Enhancement	12
17.0 External Examiners	12
18.0 Examinations Section	13
18.1 Governance of Examinations Section.....	13
18.2 Records Retention.....	13
18.3 Role and Responsibilities of Examination Instances.....	13
19.0 Definitions.....	13

1.0 Policy Scope

This policy provides a unified, coherent institutional framework designed to govern, standardise, and continuously enhance assessment practices across all programmes offered by the Mauritius Institute of Education (MIE). It applies to undergraduate and post-graduate programmes leading to teacher qualification and professional certification. The policy provides a structure for formative and summative assessment and evaluation that is aligned with the National Qualifications Framework (NQF), Mauritius Qualifications Authority (MQA) and Higher Education Commission (HEC) requirements. It reflects locally relevant and internationally accepted academic and professional standards for teacher education. Additionally, this policy is informed by recognised international reference points for quality assurance in higher education assessment to support the international recognition and portability of MIE awards.

This document has to be used in conjunction with the following approved documents/ policies:

- (i) Guidelines on the Accreditation of the Institutional Accreditation Process (IAP), HEC
https://www.hec.mu/pdf_downloads/pub_rep_pdf/IAP_Document_16072026.pdf
- (ii) Guidelines for Assessment and Moderation, Quality Assurance Authority (QAA)
https://qaa.ac.mu/pdfdocs/Guidelines_for_Assessment_Moderation_Procedures.pdf
- (iii) Anti-Plagiarism Policy, MIE
https://web.mie.ac.mu/wpcontent/uploads/2022/02/Anti_PlagiarismPolicy_Amended_210521.pdf
- (iv) MIE Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence
<https://web.mie.ac.mu/policy/>

2.0 Policy Statement

MIE teacher education programmes are based on a constructivist vision of learning, assessment, and evaluation, forming an integral part of the instructional cycle. The institution is committed to assessing academic knowledge as well as the professional skills, dispositions, and competencies required of a qualified teacher, through consistent, fair, and transparent assessment procedures.

All students are required to comply with the institution's rules and regulations governing assessment and evaluation, and with any programme or module-specific regulations.

3.0 Programmes Levels and Qualifications Framework

MIE ensures its assessment standards remain rigorous. All programmes are benchmarked against the Mauritius National Qualifications Framework (MNQF) and assessment demands are appropriately calibrated to each level.

Level	Programmes
10	Doctorate
9	Master, Post-Graduate Diploma, Post-Graduate Certificate
8	Bachelor with Honours
7	Bachelor
6	Diploma
5	Certificate

4.0 Equality and Diversity Statement

The Mauritius Institute of Education (MIE) is committed to promoting equality, diversity and inclusion in all its teaching, assessment activities, and processes. All assessment policies, guidelines and protocols comply with prevailing equality legislation and make reasonable adjustments for students with disabilities or additional learning needs.

4.1 Inclusive Assessment Design

- Assessment methods, wherever possible, offer flexibility in format (e.g. written, oral, multimedia, practical demonstration) so that students can demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes in ways that accommodate diverse needs, consistent with principles of inclusive and universal design for learning.
- Reasonable adjustments (e.g. extra time, alternative formats, assistive technology) are built into assessment design as and when required.
- Students have access to a clear, published procedure for requesting reasonable adjustments, with decisions communicated in writing within a reasonable timeframe.

5.0 Assessment and Feedback in Teacher Education

Assessment and feedback are central to students' effective learning and to their development as reflective, competent professional educators. Through formative and summative assessment, students are supported in developing self-regulation and professional judgement, and in demonstrating both academic knowledge and classroom-ready skills.

5.1 Constructive Alignment

Academic programmes at the MIE are designed according to the principle of constructive alignment, ensuring coherence between the NQF level descriptors, MIE graduate attributes, module learning outcomes, pedagogical strategies and assessment tasks. Learning outcomes are defined before teaching takes place and assessment tasks give students an opportunity to demonstrate achievement of those outcomes.

5.2 Authentic Assessment

Assessment, wherever possible, require students to demonstrate the application of their knowledge and skills in realistic professional contexts (e.g., lesson planning, micro-teaching,

reflective practice, and classroom-based evidence) rather than relying solely on the reproduction of theoretical knowledge. Assessment design also has regard to the principle of sustainable assessment, equipping students with the evaluative judgement to assess their work and practices beyond the programmes. Importantly, assessment incorporate features that make tasks more resistant to inappropriate use of generative AI to safeguard the validity of assessment as evidence of a learner's own competence.

6.0 Assessment and Feedback Guiding Principles

Assessment measures students' achievement according to professional academic judgement within a quality assurance framework. It serves three complementary purposes: assessment of learning, assessment for learning, and assessment as learning.

1. Feedback provides fair and constructive information about students' progress, strengths, and areas for improvement, and clarifies the standard expected.
2. Feedback encourages dialogue between tutors and students so that students take increasing responsibility for their own learning and professional development.
3. Assessment information is used by tutors to shape and improve teaching.

6.1 Guiding Practices

Accessibility, Fairness and Transparency

- A Module Information Sheet is provided to students at the start of each module. This includes learning outcomes, assessment details, due dates, and academic integrity requirements. It is issued via official MIE email.
- A statement on the use of Turnitin and use of AI is included in every programme handbook and assignment brief.
- Students are informed that marks remain provisional until approved by the Board of Examiners/Academic Board.

6.2 Validity, Reliability and Consistency

- Assessment tasks align with the learning outcomes of the module and programme.
- Summative assessment use agreed assessment criteria and marking rubrics to ensure consistency across markers, and a moderation process (refer to Section 10.0) should be applied.
- The volume of assessment corresponds with the credit weighting of the module (i.e., National Credit Value Transfer System (NCVTS)) and NQF level of the programme.
- Assessment is streamlined and non-repetitive. Submission dates across modules do not clash.

6.3 Student Partnership in Assessment

- Students have opportunities to contribute to the review and enhancement of assessment and feedback practices, for example through Student Feedback Questionnaires (SFQs) and programme/module evaluation meetings.
- QA mechanisms are in place to show how their input on assessment and feedback has been considered and, where appropriate, acted upon.

7.0 Formative Feedback

Formative feedback provides information about student progress during the teaching process and is used to adjust teaching and support student reflection. The formative feedback provided encourages students to actively reflect, regulate, and monitor their learning progress.

- Formative feedback is consistent with the module's learning outcomes.
- Feedback may be written or verbal and may be given individually or to a group.
- Feedback is developmental; it identifies strengths and weaknesses in relation to specific learning outcomes and offers corrective guidance.
- The tutor maintains a record of formative feedback provided to students.

8.0 Summative Assessment

Summative assessment (assessment of learning) evaluates the outcome of a module or programme component and contributes directly to the final mark.

8.1 Summative Assessment Requirements

- All assessments have clear guidelines, instructions, and assessment criteria provided to students at the start of the module.
- Assessments are designed with due consideration to inclusivity and learner diversity.
- All assessment must be fairly marked and moderated in accordance with the assessment criteria and marking rubric.

8.2 Summative Feedback

- Summative feedback is provided in cases of resubmission/resit.
- Feedback includes the grade, an explanation of how it relates to the assessment criteria, a summary of strengths and weaknesses, and corrective guidance.
- Summative feedback is provided after the declaration of results.

8.3 Assessment Weightage and Pass Mark

- Each module carries a weightage of 100%, divided between coursework and examination as determined at Department level. The minimum overall pass mark is 50%, achieved across both coursework and examination components as applicable.
- The Professional Practice Component comprises Teaching Practice, Peer-Micro Teaching and the journal/portfolio. Individual constituents or a combination of the relevant constituents (as applicable) carry a weightage of 100%. The minimum pass mark is 50%.
- The dissertation/thesis carries a weightage of 100%. The minimum pass mark is 50%.

9.0 Coursework and Continuous Assessment

Coursework requires students to demonstrate their understanding(s) related to requisite knowledge, skills and dispositions. It encompasses a wide range of activities, some of which include assignments, short tests, practical work, experiments, and/or writing. In contrast to examinations, students may be allotted several days or weeks to complete coursework often using a range of resources (i.e. academic literature).

Continuous assessment is a mode of summative assessment that evaluates students' progress *throughout* a module unlike a final summative assessment which only assesses the students at

the *end* of the module. Continuous assessment provides the students with an opportunity to track their level and self-reflect on their learning based on the grades and feedback received.

For modules with a high coursework weightage, each individual/continuous coursework represents a distinct assessment.

9.1 Word Count

A word count limit gives students a clear indication of the expected length of written assignments per module, bearing in mind the programme level and credit structure.

Level	Programme	Credits (NCVTS)	Indicative Word Count
5	Certificate	40	2,000 words $\pm 10\%$
6	Diploma	80	2,500 words $\pm 10\%$
7	Bachelor of Education (Ordinary)	120	3,000 words $\pm 10\%$
8	Bachelor of Education (Honours)	120	Assignment words $\pm 10\%$ 3,500 Dissertation words $\pm 10\%$ 12,500
9	Post Graduate Certificate	20	3,500 words $\pm 10\%$
9	Post Graduate Diploma	40	4,000 words $\pm 10\%$
9	MPhil	60	Assignment words $\pm 10\%$ 5,000 Proposal 3,000 words $\pm 10\%$ Thesis 20,000 words $\pm 10\%$
10	PhD/EdD	120	Proposal 5,000 words $\pm 10\%$ Thesis 60,000 – 80,000 words

- Where a submission exceeds the limit by more than 10%, the marker will assess only the work falling within the prescribed limit plus the permitted 10% tolerance. Material beyond this point will not be taken into consideration for assessment.

9.2 Group Work (Summative Assessment)

- Academic awards are made to individuals, not groups. No module assesses group output for more than 50% of the module mark.
- Learning outcomes must be assessable at the individual level, even within a group task.
- Assessment of group work may combine:

- (a) assessment of group output with individually assigned roles,
- (b) individual post-output reflection, and/or
- (c) an individual process record (e.g. portfolio, log).

9.3 Extensions and Late Submission

- Students may, on valid grounds, apply for an extension for the submission of the coursework//Dissertation/SBE Portfolio in writing to the Supervisor/Tutor at least 15 days before the deadline for submission.
- Extension, if granted, will be for a maximum of 2 weeks, if it does not disrupt the established Examination Calendar. Extension of submission deadlines will be granted only once on valid and special grounds.
- Where a student's ability to meet an assessment deadline is affected by illness, bereavement or other circumstances beyond their control, a Mitigating Circumstances process operates alongside extension arrangements. Claims are considered by a designated committee within a clearly published and reasonably short timeframe, and outcomes are documented and communicated to the student in writing.
- If a student fails to submit his/her coursework/dissertation/SBE portfolio by the deadline set, the following applies:
 - A penalty of 10% (up to a maximum of 72 hours) on the marks obtained.
 - After 72 hours, the coursework/dissertation/SBE portfolio will be deemed not receivable for the semester.

9.4 Attendance Requirements

- Students must maintain a minimum of 80% attendance in each module and across the overall programme to be eligible for assessment/examination in that module.
- Absences due to illness must be supported by medical certification and reported through the appropriate channel.

9.5 Submission and Plagiarism

- Written coursework are submitted through Turnitin for originality checking and digital feedback (as applicable).
- All submitted work must be the student's own; suspected plagiarism, collusion, use of AI or other misconduct is referred to the Disciplinary Committee under the institution's Anti-Plagiarism Policy and AI policy.

10.0 Examinations

10.1 Setting an Examination

Examiners apply professional judgement in setting examinations, considering the learning outcomes assessed, examination weighting, question type, and duration.

Proportion of Module Assessment	Suggested Duration
60%-100%	2-3 hours
50% and under	2 hours or less

10.2 Attendance, Absence, and Admission to Examination

- No student shall be admitted to an examination unless certified as having met the minimum attendance (80%) and completed the prescribed programme of study.

10.3 Deferral of Examination

- Deferral may be granted on grounds of ill-health, injury or other approved circumstances, with applications submitted at least 4 weeks before the examination date (except for sudden illness/injury, which must be raised within 24 hours).

10.4 Invigilation and Academic Integrity

- Any suspected case of cheating during an examination is reported immediately to the Examinations Section and handled according to the institution's academic misconduct procedures.

11.0 Teaching Practice / School-Based Experience

- Constructive feedback on teaching practice is provided both verbally and in writing, using the standardised observation/evaluation form.
- Feedback is provided before the next scheduled teaching practice visit to allow the student to reflect and apply feedback.
- In cases of potential failure, the tutor may provide a maximum of 2 additional supervised teaching sessions before a final judgement is made.
- In cases of failure, a second independent assessor observes an additional session before the outcome is confirmed.

12.0 E-Assessment

Also referred to as ‘online learning’ and digital assessment, e-assessment is the use of any digital technology or resource to assess learning outcomes. E-assessment can be used for both formative and summative assessment purposes (i.e. online quizzes and tests; discussion boards, blogs, and wikis; e-portfolios; individual/group presentations and reports using presentation software, videos and podcasts; and development of multimedia artefacts, simulations and models). This form of assessment is approached in the same way as any other assessment, with additional consideration given to:

- Student and staff familiarity with the assessment platform/software.
- Learner authentication and academic integrity declarations for online assessment.
- Contingency plans for technology or connectivity failure during high-stakes e-assessment.
- Adequate invigilation arrangements to prevent misconduct in online settings.

13.0 Assessment Criteria and Rubrics

Assessment criteria and grade-related criteria are descriptions of the skills, knowledge and attributes students need to demonstrate based on the intended learning outcomes. They detail what a student needs to demonstrate to complete an assessment successfully. Grade-related criteria explain what a student needs to demonstrate to achieve a certain grade in an assessment.

1. The assessment criteria and marking rubric should be designed alongside the development of each assessment.

2. Assessment criteria and grade-related criteria are used by markers/examiners, moderators, and external examiners to support the feedback process, and aid in the transparency process.
3. Assessment criteria are provided and explained to students prior to the assessment task.

A rubric or marking scheme is an assessment tool that outlines the marking criteria and promotes appropriate, fair, consistent and reliable marking. It includes the assessment criteria and the descriptors or assessment standards that each assessment criteria will be marked against. The rubric/marketing scheme should be developed prior to marking the assessment.

14.0 Marking and Moderation

- A moderator is appointed for each module, either an independent subject specialist or a colleague who has marked a different cohort of the same module.
- Marking uses a colour-coded system to preserve an auditable trail.
- Where work is marked digitally, an equivalent audit trail is maintained, recording the identity, date and time of each marking action and distinguishing clearly between the first and second marker's annotations.
- A defined sample of assessments is moderated — typically all failing and high-scoring (70%+) scripts, plus a percentage (e.g. 10%) of mid-range grades.
- In cases where the same module is serviced by different tutors concurrently, due to big cohort sizes, cross moderation is applicable to ensure standardisation.
- Where markers' grades differ by more than 10%, a third assessor or external examiner should be involved to reach a final decision.
- For part-time lecturers, the moderation is conducted by full-time academic staff affiliated with the department and/or possessing the specialisation.
- In case of peer teaching or oral presentation, a video recording and/or report with detailed feedback based on the rubric is submitted to the moderator by the assessor.
- Statistical adjustment of marks to achieve a target grade distribution ("scaling") is not an acceptable substitute for academic moderation.

15.0 Academic Misconduct

All work submitted must be the student's own. Allegations of cheating, plagiarism, collusion, or other misconduct are referred to the Disciplinary Committee, whose procedures and penalties should be set out in a linked Anti-Plagiarism Policy/AI Policy.

15.1 Academic Integrity and Misconduct

- Plagiarism is a serious offence and may entail reduction in the class award, failure, or in some cases, expulsion from the Institute. In conjunction with human judgement, Turnitin reports are used to detect plagiarism and assess the originality of students' submission with a view to establishing potential academic misconduct in line with the anti-plagiarism policy.

- The unauthorised use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools to produce work submitted, in whole or in part, as a student's own is a form of academic misconduct. Turnitin reports include an AI generated content score which may serve as an indicator of potential use of generative AI tools. Given the current limitations and error rates of such tools, staff must exercise professional judgement rather than relying on detection scores alone.
- Module Information Sheets and assignment briefs must refer to the Anti-plagiarism and AI policies.
- All work submitted by a student should be his/her own original work. Where it is alleged that a student is guilty of cheating and/or plagiarism, collusion or interference with another student's academic work or performance, the allegations shall be referred to the Disciplinary Committee.

16.0 Final Marks, Grading, and Results

16.1 Grading Scale

The following grading scale applies across all coursework and examinations.

Letter Grades	Grade Point	Percentage
A+	4.00	$x \geq 90$
A		$80 \leq x < 90$
A-		$70 \leq x < 80$
B+	3.00	$65 \leq x < 70$
B		$60 \leq x < 65$
B-		$55 \leq x < 60$
C	2.00	$50 \leq x < 55$
D Partly referred	0.00	50 and above, but fails in one component
E	0	$40 \leq x < 50$
F	0	$x < 40$

16.2 Ratification and Declaration of Results

- All marks remain provisional and confidential until approved by the Board of Examiners/Academic Board.
- The Board of Examiners applies a documented, consistently applied policy for considering candidates whose marks fall close to a grade or classification boundary; this policy is applied equally to all eligible candidates in the relevant cohort.
- Students receive a computer-generated transcript with no signature at the end of each semester and their transcript, duly signed, at the end of the programme from the Examinations Section.

16.3 Appeal

- After the declaration of results and receipt of transcript, a student may request for a review of his/her examination script or coursework(s), if s/he is dissatisfied with his/her results within fifteen days of official release.
- Appeal or review is not applicable for School/Work Based Experience.

16.4 Re-Sit

- Students can take resits as per the maximum duration of their respective programme. The final grade for a re-sit module is capped at C.

16.5 Assessment Data and Quality Enhancement

- Aggregate assessment data (e.g. pass rates, grade distributions, patterns of late or non-submission) are reviewed at programme and institutional levels, not only at the level of the individual student, to inform the continuous improvement of teaching and assessment design.
- Programmes report on assessment outcomes as part of annual programme monitoring and review processes, with findings shared with relevant staff and, where appropriate, with students.
- Significant or unexplained variations in outcomes across cohorts, markers, modules, or delivery modes should be investigated by the Department/Programmes and addressed through policy and practice review.

17.0 External Examiners

External Examiners hold a key quality assurance role by verifying that the academic standards of programmes are comparable to equivalent programmes nationally or internationally; and confirming that the level of achievement expected of students is appropriate for the qualification being awarded.

External Examiners are identified by Departments in consultation with their respective Head of School.

They should:

- (a) be at least at the rank of Associate Professor or equivalent; exceptionally, in areas where there is a scarcity of qualified personnel, a Senior Lecturer or equivalent may be considered;
- (b) hold a PhD degree;
- (c) have a significant track record of publications in his/her area(s) of expertise;
- (d) be a permanent full-time member of staff of a reputed university or research institution; and
- (e) in principle, be appointed for a term of three (3) to five (5) years, as appropriate.

External Examiners are given access to all available materials and opportunities to meet staff and students as deemed necessary to reach the judgements required by their position.

They are required to submit a duly filled Examiners' report form to the Head of Examinations section by the specified deadline, preferably before they leave. They may also write a report on confidential matters, addressed to the Director. Should they so wish, they may submit a more detailed report to the Head of Department / Head of School.

18.0 Examinations Section

18.1 Governance of Examinations Section

The governance of the Examination Section is founded on a framework of policies, procedures, roles, and controls that ensures examinations are conducted fairly, securely, transparently, and in compliance with institutional and regulatory requirements. Key governance responsibilities encompass policy implementation, examination planning and administration, assessment integrity and security, results management, risk management and compliance with norms, and continuous improvement of the system.

18.2 Records Retention

The Records Retention Policy establishes guidelines for the retention, storage, archiving, and disposal of examination-related records maintained by the Examinations Section. These records include both physical and electronic documents such as examination scripts, mark sheets, result grids, attendance registers, and other assessment-related records.

The policy aims to:

- Ensure compliance with applicable legal and regulatory requirements.
- Protect the integrity, confidentiality, and accessibility of examination records.
- Reduce storage and administrative costs.
- Minimise risks associated with loss, unauthorised access, or inappropriate disposal of records.
- Support institutional accountability and audit requirements.

18.3 Role and Responsibilities of Examination Instances

Key instances that are attributed specific responsibilities ensure the soundness of examination processes in the institution. These include:

- the **Board of Examiners** which ensures that assessment, examination, and award processes are fair, consistent, and in accordance with institutional regulations;
- the **Appeals Committee** which serves as an independent review instance to ensure that the institution's decisions are fair, lawful, consistent with regulations, and based on proper consideration of evidence;
- the **Disciplinary Committee** which investigates alleged breaches of discipline, provides individuals with an opportunity to be heard in accordance with the principles of natural justice, and makes recommendations or decisions on appropriate corrective or disciplinary measures.

19.0 Definitions

Assessment – The process through which the progress and achievement of a student is measured or judged against specific assessment criteria.

Assessment criteria – Specific criteria against which pieces of work are assessed, shared by markers and students.

Authentic Assessment – Assessment requiring students to apply knowledge and skills to realistic, professional (classroom) situations, rather than reproducing knowledge alone.

Constructive alignment – An approach to curriculum design ensuring coherence between learning outcomes, teaching methods, and assessment.

Feedback – Information provided to a student about the strengths and weaknesses of their work, supporting reflection and improvement.

Formative assessment – Assessment conducted during the learning process to support learning and inform teaching; does not count toward the final grade.

Moderation – The review of awarded marks by internal and/or external examiners to ensure consistency of marking standards.

Rubric / Marking scheme – A tool outlining assessment criteria and descriptors against which work is marked.

Summative assessment – Assessment that contributes directly to a student's final grade for a module or programme.

Validity – The extent to which an assessment accurately measures what it is intended to measure.