



SPEEDLINK INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATIONS (SITI)

Policy and Procedure: Recognition of Prior Learning Policy and Procedure

Policy Number: SITI-ACA-ASP-001

Version: 1.0

Effective Date: 1st, February 2026

Approved By: SITI Board of Directors

1. Purpose

To establish a clear, fair, and consistent framework for assessing student learning outcomes across all SITI training programs. This procedure ensures that assessments are:

- Aligned with industry-relevant learning outcomes.
- Transparent to students before instruction begins.
- Reliable, valid, and free from bias.
- Designed to support student development (formative) and certify achievement (summative).

This procedure upholds SITI's core values of Excellence and Integrity.

2. Scope

This procedure applies to:

- All students in any SITI training pathway (Individual, Corporate, Partner/Donor-supported, NYSC, SIWES).
- All tutors and lecturers delivering training and evaluating students.
- All assessment types including: quizzes, assignments, practical projects, presentations, final exams, and the Business Development Plan (Graduation Week, Monday).
- All programs from short courses to full certificate programs.

This procedure does not apply to the assessment of tutors or staff (covered under staff performance management).

3. Definitions

Term	Definition
Formative Assessment	Low-stakes or no-stakes assessments designed to provide feedback and guide learning during the course (e.g., weekly quizzes, in-class exercises).

Summative Assessment	High-stakes assessments that determine final grades and certification (e.g., final exam, major project, Business Development Plan presentation).
Learning Outcome	A statement of what a student is expected to know, understand, or be able to do after completing a module or program.
Rubric	A scoring guide that lists criteria for evaluating student work and describes levels of quality (e.g., excellent, satisfactory, needs improvement).
Moderation	The process of reviewing assessments and grades to ensure consistency and fairness across different tutors or cohorts.
Anonymous Marking	Assessing student work without knowing the student's identity (where technically feasible, e.g., numeric ID instead of name).
Resit	A second attempt at a failed summative assessment, offered after the original attempt.
Referral	A deferred assessment granted due to valid absence (medical, compassionate grounds).

4. Guiding Principles

- **Transparency:** Assessment criteria, weighting, and deadlines are published in the module syllabus and on the LMS at least 7 days before the first assessment.
- **Alignment:** Every assessment directly measures one or more published learning outcomes.

- **Fairness:** All students are assessed under equivalent conditions. Special accommodations are provided for students with disabilities (per Equal Opportunity and Diversity Policy).
- **Timely Feedback:** Students receive constructive feedback within the timeframes specified in Section 7.
- **Continuous Improvement:** Assessment data is used to improve teaching and curriculum (Section 10).

5. Types of Assessment

SITI uses a blended assessment model appropriate to IT, digital skills, and entrepreneurship training.

Assessment Type	Description	Typical Weighting (of final grade)	Formative or Summative?
Weekly Quizzes (LMS-based)	Short multiple-choice or coding challenges after each module.	10–20%	Formative (but may count)
Practical Assignments	Hands-on tasks (e.g., configure a network, build a web page, write a Python script).	20–30%	Summative
Mid-Term Project	Individual or group project at mid-point of program.	15–25%	Summative
Business Development Plan (BDP)	Group or individual presentation of a business plan (Graduation Week, Monday)	15–20%	Summative

		– see main SOP Section 4.6.1).		
Final Examination		Proctored, time-limited exam (practical or theory).	30–40%	Summative
Attendance & Participation		Based on lecture attendance (2x weekly sessions per main SOP) and active engagement.	5–10%	Formative

Note: Exact weightings are specified in each program’s module syllabus. A student must achieve at least 40% in the summative components combined (excluding attendance) to pass the program.

6. Grading Scale

SITI uses a standard percentage-based grading scale. The final grade determines eligibility for certification and awards (Best Student, Academic Excellence, etc. – per main SOP Section 4.7.2).

Percentage Range	Letter Grade	Grade Point	Classification
90 – 100%	A	4.0	Distinction
80 – 89%	B	3.5	Merit
70 – 79%	C	3.0	Pass (Good)
60 – 69%	D	2.0	Pass (Satisfactory)
50 – 59%	E	1.0	Marginal Pass

Below 50%	F	0.0	Fail
-----------	---	-----	------

Pass Requirement: A student must achieve a final overall grade of 50% or higher (Grade E or above) to be awarded a certificate. For EC-Council or other external certifications, the partner’s minimum passing grade applies (typically 70% – students will be notified).

Awards:

- Best Student: Highest overall grade in the cohort (minimum 85%).
- Academic Excellence Award: Top 10% of cohort or specific subject excellence.
- Best Project: Highest score on Business Development Plan or final project.

7. Assessment Process

7.1 Publication of Assessment Plan

At the start of each program (during Orientation – Section 4.2.2 of main SOP), the Training Coordinator ensures that each student receives a Module Assessment Plan containing:

- List of all assessments (dates, weightings, format).
- Submission deadlines and late submission penalties.
- Rubrics for major assignments (BDP, final project, practical exams).
- Resit and referral policies.

The plan is uploaded to the LMS and distributed in print if requested.

7.2 Submission of Assessments

Assessment Type	Submission Method	Deadline
Weekly quizzes	LMS (automated)	End of each week (Sunday, 11:59 PM).

Practical assignments	LMS file upload or GitHub link	As specified (typically 7-14 days after release).
Business Development Plan	LMS + in-person presentation during Graduation Week (Monday).	As per academic calendar (end of Month 5).
Final examination	In-person or proctored online via LMS.	Scheduled during Graduation Week (Friday).

Late Submission Penalty: 5% deduction per calendar day late, up to a maximum of 5 days. After 5 days, the assessment receives a mark of zero unless an extension has been granted (see Section 7.6).

7.3 Academic Integrity

All assessments are subject to SITI's Malpractice and Maladministration Policy. Tutors use plagiarism detection tools (where available) and may conduct viva voce (oral examination) to verify originality.

AI Usage Policy: Students may use AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, GitHub Copilot) for assistance, but must:

- Declare any AI use in a comment at the top of their submission.
- Not submit AI-generated content as their own original work. Tutors may require an oral defence of any suspiciously generated code or text.

Violations are handled under the Malpractice Policy.

7.4 Marking and Feedback

Responsibility	Action	Timeline
Tutor	Marks assessments using rubrics provided in the Module Assessment Plan. Provides written or video feedback (strengths, areas for improvement).	Within 10 working days of submission deadline.
Tutor	Enters grades into the LMS gradebook.	Within 10 working days.
Training Coordinator	Conducts moderation (random sample of 10% of marked work per tutor) to ensure consistency.	Within 5 working days of grade entry.

Anonymous Marking: For written exams and LMS-based quizzes where the system allows, student names are hidden during marking. For projects and BDP presentations, anonymous marking is not feasible; instead, at least two tutors assess the presentation, and the average is taken.

Feedback Quality: Feedback must be constructive, specific, and actionable. Generic comments like “good job” are insufficient. Examples: “Your Python function handles edge cases well, but variable naming could be more descriptive.”

7.5 Release of Grades

Grades are published on the LMS gradebook. Students receive an automated notification when grades are posted. The Training Coordinator ensures that grade distributions are reviewed for anomalies (e.g., all students scoring 95% or 30%) before final release.

Grade Review: A student who believes an error has occurred (e.g., miscalculation, incorrect rubric application) should first contact the tutor. If unresolved, they may use the SITI Appeal Procedure.

7.6 Extensions, Resits, and Referrals

Situation	Procedure
Request for extension (before deadline)	Student submits written request to Tutor and Training Coordinator with reason (e.g., illness, family emergency). Up to 7-day extension may be granted without penalty. Longer extensions require Coordinator approval.
Missed assessment due to valid cause (e.g., medical emergency)	Student provides evidence within 5 working days. A referral (deferred assessment) is scheduled within 15 working days of the original deadline. No penalty.
Fail (grade below 50%) in a summative assessment	Student is offered one resit attempt. Resit format may differ (e.g., alternative project, oral exam). Maximum resit grade is capped at 50% (Pass). Resit must be completed within 30 working days of grade notification.
Fail resit	Student fails the module. They may repeat the module in a future cohort (additional fees apply). No certificate is awarded until all modules are passed.

No automatic resit for attendance-based points – attendance cannot be “resat”. Students with attendance below 75% (unless accommodated) may be disqualified from certification per the Attendance Policy.

7.7 Special Consideration for Business Development Plan (Graduation Week)

Per main SOP Section 4.6.1, the BDP presentation is a required summative assessment. The following additional rules apply:

- Group presentations: Each member must present a portion. Individual grades may differ based on contribution and Q&A performance.
- Rubric: The BDP is assessed on: Opportunity analysis (20%), Innovation/problem-solving (25%), Feasibility (20%), Presentation quality (20%), Q&A responses (15%).
- Failure: If a student fails the BDP, they may resubmit a written plan within 14 days (maximum grade 50%). If still failing, they must repeat the program's entrepreneurship module.

8. Assessment Moderation

To ensure consistency across tutors and cohorts, the Training Coordinator implements:

Level	Action	Frequency
Internal moderation	Random sample of 10% of marked work per tutor reviewed by a second tutor.	After each major assessment (mid-term, final, BDP).
Tutor calibration	Tutors meet to review sample answers and apply rubrics to common examples.	Before each program start and mid-point.
External moderation (for partner-certified courses)	Sample of assessments sent to EC-Council or other body as required.	Per partner agreement.

If moderation reveals significant inconsistency (e.g., more than 10% difference between two tutors' marks on the same work), the Training Coordinator may:

- Adjust the affected grades (up or down) after consultation.
- Require re-marking by a third tutor.
- Provide retraining to the inconsistent tutor.

9. Recording and Reporting

9.1 Grade Records

- Tutors maintain a detailed gradebook on the LMS, with backup copies (cloud and local) per main SOP Section 4.2.1 (student master file).
- Final grades are signed off by the Training Coordinator and stored in the student's academic file for 5 years post-graduation (per Section 5.1 of main SOP).

9.2 Student Access

Students can view their own grades, feedback, and assessment history on the LMS at any time. They may request a meeting with their tutor to discuss progress.

9.3 Progress Reports

Tutors submit student progress reports to the Training Coordinator by the 5th of each month (per main SOP Section 4.3.2). These reports identify at-risk students (e.g., below 50% in any assessment, attendance below 75%). The Coordinator initiates a support plan within 72 hours.

10. Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

- Student feedback: Anonymous tutor evaluation forms (Section 4.3.2 of main SOP) include questions on assessment clarity, fairness, and feedback timeliness.
 - Assessment review: The Training Coordinator analyses assessment data (pass rates, grade distributions, item difficulty for quizzes) after each cohort. Poorly performing assessment items are revised or removed.
 - Annual external benchmarking: For core IT modules, SITl compares its assessment standards with industry certifications (e.g., EC-Council, CompTIA) to ensure alignment.
-

11. Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Assessment-Related Responsibilities
Training Coordinator	Approves assessment plans; conducts moderation; manages resit/referral requests; signs off final grades; reports to Board.
Tutors	Design valid assessments using rubrics; mark and provide feedback within 10 working days; identify at-risk students; offer office hours for assessment queries.
Technical Team	Ensure LMS assessment tools function (quizzes, gradebook, submission portals); archive assessment records.
Admin Staff	Maintain student assessment files; issue certificates based on final grades.

12. Related Documents and Policies

- SITI Comprehensive SOP (Version 2.0, April 2026) – Sections 4.3, 4.6, 4.7.
- SITI Appeal Procedure (academic grade appeals).
- SITI Malpractice and Maladministration Policy.
- SITI Equal Opportunity and Diversity Policy (accommodations).
- SITI Attendance and Leave of Absence Policy (to be developed).
- SITI Recognition of Prior Learning Policy (credit for prior learning may affect assessment requirements).

13. Policy Review

This Assessment Procedure will be reviewed biannually as part of SITI's SOP review cycle (Section 5.3 of main SOP) and whenever significant assessment-related issues arise (e.g., grade inflation, external partner feedback).

Appendix A: Sample Assessment Rubric – Business Development Plan Presentation

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Opportunity Analysis (20%)	Clear identification of market gap, target customer, and size. Data-driven.	Identifies opportunity with some data.	Vague opportunity, little data.	No clear opportunity.
Innovation/Problem-Solving (25%)	Novel, creative solution that clearly addresses the problem.	Good solution, some innovation.	Conventional solution, minor innovation.	No clear solution.
Feasibility (20%)	Realistic financials, resources, timeline. Risks addressed.	Mostly feasible, minor gaps.	Questionable feasibility.	Not feasible.
Presentation Quality (20%)	Professional slides, confident delivery, within time.	Good delivery, minor issues.	Adequate but lacks polish.	Poor delivery or time management.
Q&A Responses (15%)	Clear, confident, accurate answers to all questions.	Answers most questions well.	Struggles with some questions.	Unable to answer.

Total Score (out of 100) = Sum of (Criterion Score × Weight).

Appendix B: Assessment Extension / Referral Request Form

Field	Information
Student Name	
Program / Cohort	
Module / Assessment	
Original Deadline	
Type of Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Extension (before deadline) <input type="checkbox"/> Referral (after missed assessment due to valid cause)
Reason (attach evidence if available: medical note, police report, etc.)	
Preferred New Date (for referral)	
Student Signature	
Date	

For Office Use:

- Approved by Tutor: Yes No – Reason: _____
- Approved by Training Coordinator: Yes No
- New deadline / referral date: _____
- Student notified on: _____