

## FACULTY OF APPLIED HEALTH SCIENCES

### GRADE REASSESSMENT POLICY

---

1. A request for a reassessment of a course grade must be done **within six months of the end of the term in which the course was taken**. This process is initiated only after the student has attempted to resolve the matter informally with the instructor. A written response from the instructor to the student is required, with reasons, within **two weeks** of the informal inquiry.
2. If this process of informal resolution proves unsuccessful, within **two weeks** of receiving this response the student may initiate a formal request for a reassessment by submitting a completed copy of a \*[“Request for a Formal Inquiry or a Reassessment”](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infoereg/forms/FormalInquiry.pdf) form to the appropriate Associate Dean (Undergraduate or Graduate Affairs). The Associate Dean shall within **one week** submit a copy of the completed form to the Associate Chairperson of the department involved. The Associate Chairperson shall decide whether the request meets the Faculty criteria for a formal reassessment (see page2). (\*<http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infoereg/forms/FormalInquiry.pdf>)
3. If a reassessment is considered inappropriate, the Associate Dean shall be informed and communicate this to the student in writing. The student may pursue the matter further through the procedures for a formal inquiry. (See [Policy 70](#))
4. If a reassessment is considered appropriate, the Associate Chairperson shall appoint a second reader who shall be acceptable to both the student and the instructor. Such a reader may be external. In the interests of impartiality, steps should be taken to ensure the anonymity of the student to the appointed reader. The student and instructor will be asked to provide all documentation pertaining to the case. Written work from other students may be presented, with their consent, for purposes of comparison, provided that this is done anonymously.
5. If the second reader confirms the original grade, s/he will communicate this in writing, with reasons to the Associate Chairperson.
6. If the second reader believes that either a higher or lower grade should be awarded s/he will submit a written report, again providing reasons for the proposed adjustment to the instructor and the Associate Chairperson. If the instructor and second reader agree on the adjustment, this will be communicated in writing to the Associate Chairperson.
7. If the instructor and second reader do not agree, the Associate Chairperson, **with the agreement of the student and the instructor**, shall point a third reader. The third reader will consider the grades recommended by the instructor and the second reader and will choose one or the other. This decision will be reported in writing to the instructor, the second reader and the Associate Chairperson.
8. Normally within three weeks of submission to the new reader(s), the Associate Chairperson shall inform the Associate Dean of the final decision in writing, including copies of the reports from the reader(s).
9. Within three weeks of receipt of the final decision, the Associate Dean shall inform the student and instructor of this in writing, **including the reasons for the change**.
10. If the student seeks further remedy this may be done by formal appeal through the Faculty Committee on Student Appeals. (See [Policy 70](#)).

## **APPLIED HEALTH SCIENCES CRITERIA FOR REASSESSMENT**

It shall be AHS policy to consider any student request on which the student is able to produce reasonable grounds for a reassessment. Students should be aware that such a request may result in a grade which is higher, the same as, or lower than the original grade.

In the case of a student appeal of a grade awarded in an AHS course, the following criteria are those which describe whether such an appeal should be treated as a request for reassessment, as opposed to a formal inquiry. In accordance with the University Student Appeals Policy and Procedures, a reassessment is presented as alternative procedure for dealing with Type 1 grievances. Type 1 and 2 grievances are described as follows.

**Type 1:** Alleged errors in academic judgment.

**Type 2:** Other types of alleged errors or injustices

- e.g., Unfair method of evaluation
- Instructor deviated from course outline
- Instructor deviated from announced method of assessment with reasonable notice
- Instructor was biased or prejudiced against the student
- Instructor refused to accept receipt of legitimate medical evidence

Thus, if the reasons stated by the student for appealing their grade fall clearly under the heading of a Type 2 grievance, the matter shall be pursued further as a formal inquiry, otherwise the complaint may be handled as a reassessment.