



# International University of Leadership

---

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

## ***Grading Policies and Regulations***

The International University of Leadership is authorized to grant degrees upon successful completion of Business programs: Bachelor of Business Administration, Master of Business Administration and Doctorate of Business Administration through online as well as on-campus delivery modes.

The following grading systems and procedures have been developed to achieve a uniform standard and comparability across IUL business administration programs. A standard letter grading system has been established in order to achieve this outcome. All final official grades shall be assigned and reported according to the letter grade system, effective for all courses starting on July 10, 2012 and onward.

The degree grading system is established for the purpose of reporting official course outcomes and is not intended to limit ways in which Faculty members may choose to provide feedback to students during a course or program.

Evaluation of a student's performance in a particular course or section is the prerogative of the faculty member, graduate teaching assistant or other instructor collectively responsible for that course or section. No grade assigned to a student in a particular course or section may be changed without the consent of the instructor responsible for that course or section.

Each instructor who assigns grades has the responsibility to implement grading procedures that are fair and equitable, and to provide a reasonable evaluation of the student's performance in the course.

Each student should be informed at the beginning of the semester of the means to be used to determine grades in each course or section. This information should be included in the instructor's course syllabus.

To assist with the determination of the appropriate final letter grade, this Policy provides a numerical percentage range for each letter grade. Each letter grade has a numeric grade point value assigned.

Letter grades do not become official until they appear on the student's transcript. Instructors may notify students of unofficial course grades, but the registrar reserves the right to correct or adjust unofficial grades in order to maintain equity among sections and ensure conformity.

The posting of grades is strictly regulated by federal law, in particular the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA" or "IUL Amendment"). Pursuant to FERPA, grades are



# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

considered a part of a student's educational record and may not be released or posted in any personally identifiable form unless the student gives written consent for each occasion on which grades are to be posted.

## Grading of Assessments

Below is a description of the grading scale used for various types of course assessments.

## IUL Assessments Grading Rubrics

### Individual Presentation

#### 10-15 PowerPoint Slides

Students	Criterion Q1 (20%)	Criterion Q2 (20%)	Criterion Q3 (20%)	Criterion Q4 (20%)	Presentation (10%)	Structure (10%)	Grade (100%)
Student 1							
Student 2							
Student 3							
Student 4							





# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

## Short Essay Marking Scheme

### Option 1

*300 - 500 words with APA citations and references*

90-100%	A quite exceptional and outstanding answer, providing insights, which would not be available publicly, and would, with some editing, be publishable. In addition to the features of the next section, this range is distinguished by superior organization, economic use of language and totally comprehensive, given the conditions of the exercise.
80-89%	An answer which demonstrates an excellent understanding of the question and of the complexity of the issues involved. There is a sound basis of relevant factual knowledge and/or the theoretical issues involved. Most of the important issues are dealt with in a detailed, specific and systematic way. There is either some measure of original thinking in the answer or an accurate and comprehensive account is given in a way which demonstrates understanding, for example by structuring the material such that it could not have been based just on reproduction of lecture notes and course material. Evidence of creativity, critical approach, and wide reading beyond the core subject matter.
70-80%	Excellent structure and flow, use of English and essay writing skills. No grammatical or spelling errors. Lively and interesting discussion, introducing original ideas and thoughts into the focus of the assignment. References and bibliography accurately included and listed according to the required standard. Well-focused with evidence to support individual contribution and all aspects of the assignment requirements. Detailed evidence of appropriate reading, reflective evaluation and a critical analysis of the key issues involved.
60-69%	Good structure and flow use of English and essay writing skills. Few grammatical or spelling errors. Interesting discussion incorporating evidence of original thought into the focus of the assignment. Few errors in the citing of and listing of references/bibliography. Good focus to the essay with evidence of individual contribution and most of the aspects of the assignment requirements. Good level of evidence with regard to appropriate reading, reflective evaluation, and a critical analysis of the key issues involved.
50-59%	Satisfactory structure and flow with minimal errors displayed in the use of English and essay writing skills. Some evidence of original thought and a satisfactory level of discussion. Some errors in the citing and listing of references/bibliography. Satisfactory focus to the essay with some evidence of individual contribution and various aspects of the assignment requirements. Satisfactory level of evidence with regard to background reading, reflective evaluation, and critical analysis of the key issues involved.
40-49%	A basic attention to structure and flow, use of English and essay writing skills. No evidence of original thought, and discussion at a basic level only. Several errors in the citing and listing of references/bibliography. A basic focus to the essay with minimal evidence of individual contribution and other aspects of the assignment requirements. Basic level of evidence with regard to background reading, reflective evaluation, and critical analysis of the key issues involved.



# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

30-39%	Inappropriate structure and flow, use of English and essay writing skills. No evidence of original thought and a poor demonstration of discussion skills. References erratically and/or incorrectly cited both in the text and within the listing (including bibliography). Unsatisfactory focus to the essay with little or no evidence of individual contribution or other aspects of the assignment requirements. Little or no evidence of background reading, reflective evaluation, or critical analysis of the key issues involved.
20-29%	The answer may meander around the general area of the question, but with very little coherence or structure. There is no evidence of criticism, synthesis or evaluation.\
10-19%	Some notes relevant to the question, but without coherence.
1-9%	Notes of little relevance to the question or only an introductory paragraph and one or two scattered thoughts.
0%	No answer is presented. A zero mark may also be warranted for unfair practice such as plagiarism or collusion



# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

## Option 2

*300 - 500 words with APA citations and references*

Grade Allocation Per skill	Excellent	Good	Need Improvement
<b>Writing</b>	Highly relevant content. Excellent organization. Well-written sentences.	Relevant content. Good organization. Correctly constructed sentences.	Minimally relevant content. Poor organization. Lack of sentence variety and few grammatical errors.
	(20%)	(15%)	(5%)
<b>Knowledge</b>	Excellent understanding of the subject knowledge	Sufficient Understanding of the subject knowledge	Some understanding of the subject knowledge
	(40%)	(20%)	(10%)
<b>Analytical</b>	Excellent analysis with illustration	Some ability to analyze the given task	Minimal ability to analyze the task
	(40%)	(20%)	(10%)



# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

## Option 3

*300 - 500 words with APA citations and references*

	<b>Novice</b> (15%)	<b>Competent</b> (20%)	<b>Distinguished</b> (25%)
Purpose and focus	Limited awareness of audience and/or purpose	An attempt to establish and maintain purpose and communicate with the audience	Establishes and maintains clear focus; evidence of distinctive voice and/or appropriate tone
Development of ideas	Minimal idea development, limited and/or unrelated details	Unelaborated idea development; unrelated and/or repetitious details to depth of idea development supported by elaborated, relevant details	Depth and complexity of ideas supported by rich, engaging and/or pertinent details; evidence analysis, reflection and insight
Organization	Random or weak organization	Logical organization	Careful and/or suitable organization
Vocabulary/Terms	Incorrect and/or ineffective language	Acceptable, effective language	Precise and/or rich language



# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

## MBA/DBA Project Papers 6-10 pages and more with APA citations and references

Student:		Date:						
	Item	Relevance	Knowledge	Analysis	Argument and Structure	Critical Evaluation	Presentation	Reference to Literature
	Weight	15%	20%	10%	20%	10%	10%	15%
<b>A</b>	<b>95 - 100</b>	The work examined is exemplary and provides clear evidence of a complete grasp of the knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to the Level of the qualification. There is also ample excellent evidence showing that all the learning outcomes and responsibilities appropriate to that Level are fully satisfied. At this level it is expected that the work will be exemplary in all the categories cited above. It will demonstrate a particularly compelling evaluation, originality, and elegance of argument, interpretation or discourse.						
	Score							
<b>A-</b>	<b>90 - 94</b>	The work examined is outstanding and demonstrates comprehensive knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to the Level of the qualification. There is also excellent evidence showing that all the learning outcomes and responsibilities appropriate to that level are fully satisfied. At this level it is expected that the work will be outstanding in the majority of the categories cited above or by demonstrating particularly compelling evaluation and elegance of argument, interpretation or discourse.						
	Score							
<b>B+</b>	<b>87 - 89</b>	The work examined is excellent and is evidence of comprehensive knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to the Level of the qualification. There is also excellent evidence showing that all the learning outcomes and responsibilities appropriate to that level are satisfied. At this level it is expected that the work will be excellent in the majority of the categories cited above or by demonstrating particularly compelling evaluation and elegance of argument, interpretation or discourse.						
	Score							
<b>B</b>	<b>83 - 86</b>	Directly relevant to the requirements of the assessment	A substantial knowledge of relevant material, showing a clear grasp of themes, questions and issues therein	Good analysis, clear and orderly	Generally coherent and logically structured, using an appropriate mode of argument and/or theoretical mode(s)	May contain some distinctive or independent thinking; may begin to formulate an independent position in relation to theory and/or practice.	Well written, with standard spelling and grammar, in a readable style with acceptable format	Critical appraisal of up-to-date and/or appropriate literature. Recognition of different perspectives. Very good use of source material. Uses a range of sources
	Score							
<b>B-</b>	<b>80 - 82</b>	Some attempt to address the requirements of the assessment: may drift away from this in less focused passages	Adequate knowledge of a fair range of relevant material, with intermittent evidence of an appreciation of its significance	Some analytical treatment, but may be prone to description, or to narrative, which lacks clear analytical purpose	Some attempt to construct a coherent argument, but may suffer loss of focus and consistency, with issues at stake stated only vaguely, or theoretical mode(s) couched in simplistic terms	Sound work which expresses a coherent position only in broad terms and in uncritical conformity to one or more standard views of the topic	Competently written, with only minor lapses from standard grammar, with acceptable format	Uses a variety of literature which includes some recent texts and/or appropriate literature, though not necessarily including a substantive amount beyond library texts. Competent use of source material.
	Score							



# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

<b>C+</b>	<b>77 - 79</b>	Some correlation with the requirements of the assessment but there is a significant degree of irrelevance	Basic understanding of the subject but addressing a limited range of material	Largely descriptive or narrative, with little evidence of analysis	A basic argument is evident, but mainly supported by assertion and there may be a lack of clarity and coherence	Some evidence of a view starting to be formed but mainly derivative.	A simple basic style but with significant deficiencies in expression or format that may pose obstacles for the reader	appropriate literature used. Goes beyond the material tutor has provided. Limited use of sources to support a point. Weak use of source
	<b>Score</b>							
<b>C</b>	<b>72 - 76</b>	Relevance to the requirements of the assessment may be very intermittent, and may be reduced to its vaguest and least challenging terms	A limited understanding of a narrow range of material	Heavy dependence on description, and/or on paraphrase, is common	Little evidence of coherent argument: lacks development and may be repetitive or thin	Almost wholly derivative: the writer's contribution rarely goes beyond simplifying paraphrase	Numerous deficiencies in expression and presentation; the writer may achieve clarity (if at all) only by using a simplistic or repetitious style	Barely adequate use of literature. Over reliance on material provided by the tutor.
	<b>Score</b>							
<b>C-</b>	<b>70 - 72</b>	The work examined provides insufficient evidence of the knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to the Level of the qualification. The evidence provided shows that some of the learning outcomes and responsibilities appropriate to that Level are satisfied. The work will be weak in some of the indicators.						
	<b>Score</b>							
<b>D</b>	<b>65 - 69</b>	The work examined is unacceptable and provides little evidence of the knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to the Level of the qualification. The evidence shows that few of the learning outcomes and responsibilities appropriate to that Level are satisfied. The work will be weak in several of the indicators.						
	<b>Score</b>							
<b>F</b>	<b>64 - 0</b>	The work examined is unacceptable and provides almost no evidence of the knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to the Level of the qualification. The evidence fails to show that any of the learning outcomes and responsibilities appropriate to that Level are satisfied. The work will be weak in the majority or all of the indicators.						
	<b>Score</b>							
<b>Final grade and feedback</b>								

## Discussion Forums

### Evaluation of discussion forum participation

Discussion forum postings are graded on a scale of 0 to 100.

A score of 82 (equivalent to a grade of B-) or higher indicates that the student has met the average response.

The following scoring matrix will be used by the professor to assign a score each week.



# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

Point/Value Range	Characterization of Response
90 - 100 (A)	The postings clearly build upon and synthesize the ideas of other discussion participants' contributions, including clearly identifiable proactive strategies and approaches that have the potential to enhance the discussion.
82 - 89 (B)	The posting foci are clear, concise and cogent, and demonstrate a thoughtful extension, exploration and explication of related issues presented by discussion participants.
1 - 81 (C) FAILURE	Minimal interaction with other discussion participants is evident. Postings are superficial, lacking clarity, and are not specifically cogent to the topic, as well as not visibly demonstrating efforts to extend the topic toward more in-depth exploration/discussion.
0	No response/participation

In addition to the criteria listed in the scoring matrix above, there are some additional facets that can enhance the quality of participation in the graded discussion forums:

- 1) Comment on, clarify and discuss the postings. Scholarly comments, weblinks and discourse that is not just your opinion, is the expectation.
- 2) Constructive critique of the postings (avoid colloquial chatter - see \*\* below).
- 3) Present alternate positions supported by literature.
- 4) Explore and link issues in the forums to research literature, course readings and external links.
- 5) Articulate the application of leadership strategies to the issues addressed in the forums.

**\*\*Important: grades for the discussion forums are based on participation and engaging other students in a dialogue (discussion). Although comments such as "that's great!", " I agree", " great ideas" are important in a general conversation these comments are not considered in grading active participation, critique or dialogue. These statements are regarded as fillers. Please review your own comments in the forums for quality and substance.**

## Student Appeals of Grades

Grades are not negotiable. There should be no questioning of a faculty member's academic judgment on a grade. In registering for a class, students implicitly agree to allow the faculty member to make a qualitative judgment of their command of the subject matter, which will be



# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

expressed as a letter grade. Any questioning or appeal of a grade should therefore be limited to procedure, e.g., to computational errors or failures to follow grading policies set forth in the syllabi.

Any system of grade-appeal should protect the rights of faculty members as well as the rights of students. The results of any system of grade-appeal should not be binding upon the faculty member. Any decision to initiate a change of grade should remain the faculty member's. Any procedural complaint regarding a change of grade must be initiated within four weeks of the beginning of the next scheduled term, not including summer sessions.

A student with a complaint must first discuss the matter with the faculty member. If the matter is not resolved at this level, the student may then take the matter to the chairperson of the department involved. The chairperson will discuss the case with the faculty member and may recommend that the faculty member review the grade. Upon the request of the student, the campus director or dean will proceed in similar fashion. Should the student request it, the campus director/dean will pass the matter on to the CAO.

This process of review gives the academic director and CAO the right to discuss the matter directly with the faculty member, and if they think it appropriate, request that the faculty member review the grade. Any recommendations made will not be binding upon the faculty member against whom the complaint is lodged. The decision to change a grade remains with the faculty member.

## **Delivery of Grades**

The primary instructor of a class, as a member of the faculty at the International University of Leadership, is the sole authority for reporting and/or changing a course grade. In those instances when a faculty member's appointment has been terminated, or a faculty member has resigned or is deceased, the sole authority for approving and/or changing a course grade rests with the Academic Director or the Chief Academic Officer.

In all cases, an approved grading Proxy, presently "the Operations Director" enters grades for faculty members in the SIS system. However, the grading Proxy cannot approve grades and/or submit grade changes; these two actions (approving grades and submitting grade changes) can only be accomplished by the instructor or an academic officer.

- Grades are due within one week (*5 calendar days*) following the scheduled date of the final examination or final project.



# International University of Leadership

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

- Each student whose name is listed on the course roster is validly registered for the section and must receive a grade appropriate to the grade type (A-F) for which a student registered.
- Grades are assigned using the grading scale published by the University.

**Note:** See the [Grading Scale](#) page for a complete list of authorized grades.

## University Policy for Final Grade Appeals by Student

The following policy addresses final course grade appeals only. This grade appeal policy does not address complaints about specific class assignment grades.

### *Informal Grade Appeal*

If a student has a question or complaint about a final course grade, the student should first try to work out the issue with the instructor on an informal basis.

### *Formal Grade Appeal*

Claims made at each step of the following process and the response to those claims must address the previous claims/response directly with documented evidence to support it as indicated and appropriate.

**Step 1 of Appeal:** If the matter is not resolved amicably, the student can appeal the final course grade by notifying the instructor of the question/grievance **IN WRITING** using the "Grade Appeal by Student" form via the student's university email address within 15 calendar days from the last day of the semester, as indicated on the Academic Calendar.

Supporting documentation must be included at this time. A copy of the appeal must also be forwarded to the Chief Academic Officer in charge of the program or the appropriate Campus Director or Dean.

**Step 2 of Appeal:** The Instructor must respond to the student in writing, via university email address, within 15 calendar days of receipt of the appeal with a grade change or an appropriate explanation of the original grade given. The instructor's response must directly address all claims made by the student regardless of merit without supporting documentation, if warranted. A copy should be sent to the Chief Academic Officer Program in charge of the program or the appropriate Campus Director or Dean in charge of the course in question.



# International University of Leadership

---

*Where Leaders Are Born!*

**Step 3 of Appeal:** If the matter is still not resolved, the student should appeal in writing, via Post University email address, to the President/CEO of the University. All supporting documentation, including any forms, etc., should be included. The President/CEO's response must directly address all claims made by the student, regardless of merit, with supporting documentation when warranted.

**Step 4 of Appeal:** Having reviewed all supporting material, including the justification by the instructor, the President/CEO will respond to the student's concerns within fifteen (15) calendar days via Post University email.

**Step 5 of Appeal:** If the student is still not satisfied, then they should appeal in writing to the Leading Board of the University in which the course is housed and represents the instructor being grieved. Campus Director should forward all supporting documentation, including notes from any meetings, with said student or instructor for his/her review. The Leading Board should respond in writing, via Post University email address, to the student with his/her final decision within fifteen (15) calendar days of being notified. All grade change forms must be forwarded to the Office of the Registrar. **THE DECISION OF THE LEADING BOARD IS FINAL**