

Only formal examinations, written or practical, can give a clear picture of students' true knowledge and ability at university level. Continuous assessment like course work and projects are poor measures of student ability. How far do you agree with latter statement?

Written examinations s haves been a common method to assess students' knowledge throughout decades. Nevertheless, there are some alternative assessments such as projects and essays. However, whether these measurements are mostly of benefit to test students' ability or not is debated. When it comes to this argument I maintain that the merits of such a practice not only outweighe, but also outnumber the/its demerits on the following grounds.

Firstly, projects and other research-based measures examine students' ability better than written examinations owing to the fact that the acquired knowledge is applied in experimental works practically. Furthermore, some students tend to study hard before exams and memorize all the lectures to get higher scores. However, ,—however, most of the information is saved on their short-term memory and will be forgotten after examination immediately.

Secondly, deadlines for projects and course works are not as limited as written exams. Two or three hours which are given to students in an examination to transfer all of their knowledge onto a paper is not only insufficient but also unfair. Besides, there have been many students that could not be present for make exams as a result of an illness getting sick or and having an accident or could not perform well under exam's pressure.

To sum up, despite the fact that continuous assessments suffer from some negative points such as downloading information from the internet and cheating (plagiarism), its strengths are highlighted enough to overshadow its weaknesses.