

University of Twente
Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences (EB-BMS)
Examination Boards BMS

September 2024

Safeguarding Assessment Quality

Derya Demirtas, Nolen Gertz, Joyce Karreman, Pieter Jan Klok

PREAMBULE

The Examination Board has the legal task to safeguard the quality of exams and examinations. This task is tightly connected to its function to determine whether a student meets the intended final qualifications as explicated in the Education and Examination Regulation (EER), before a certificate can be handed out to a student.

As overall criteria for Assessment Quality we see that the Assessment is conducted professionally at all times, measures students' achievements, ensures equal rights to all students enrolled in the programmes and/or separate study units, addresses academic integrity, and is aligned with Education and Examination Regulation (EER) and Rules and Regulations (R&R) of the University of Twente and Faculty of Behavioural, Management, and Social Sciences.

This document serves to *guide* the process of Safeguarding Assessment Quality within BMS, and to set priorities together with the Programme Directors to focus on in the coming year(s). It is the third edition of this document, the first one was written in February 2017, the second in September 2019 (by Tanya Bondarouk, Marcel Pieterse, Mieke Boon, Ringo Ossewaarde). It will need again iterations to improve; and it is motivated by the needs due to new regulations. This guide works along three sub-structures:

- It shows five levels at which the BMS Examination Boards execute their tasks: programme, individual units, final examinations, test organisation and qualifications of examiners.
- Each level corresponds with sets of criteria for safeguarding the assessment quality. The criteria are generally given in the form of statements without setting quantitative norms since these can vary per programme. Interpretation of these criteria for different programmes lies with the Programme Directors and their teams, and – in close collaboration with the Examination Boards to safeguard the Assessment Quality.
- For each set of criteria, the Examination Boards offer suggestions and guidance for the Programme Directors, and other relevant stakeholders, to consider collecting evidence to be included in a self-assessment

The document suggests a planning and timing when the selected criteria are to be applied. This aims to take steps to improve the Assessment Quality (PDCA cycle). NB: this serves as a guide; every Examination Board sets its own yearly planning for meetings with Programme Directors.

In the spirit of continuous improvement of the Assessment Quality, the BMS Examination Boards initiate regular meetings with Programme Directors (and their teams), and expect from them:

- For every meeting (otherwise – upon an agreement with the Examination Board) - prepare a concise overview of the Assessment Quality that is the subject of the particular meeting.
- The self-assessment:
 - should reflect strong and weak points in the Assessment, and improvement plans.
 - should be evidence-based (with the help of (some of the) suggested instruments that show how the quality criteria are met.
 - may take any form (table, plain text, any visuals), and should be as concrete as possible.

It should be noticed that Programme Directors:

- are not expected to generate new evidence for every single stated criterion; they are free to rely on existing pieces of evidence (e.g. from the assessment policy, EER, syllabi, etc.), as long as a clear reference is made to the source of evidence in the self-assessment.
- need to show that they are in control over the assessment quality within their programmes.

FIVE LEVELS OF SAFEGUARDING ASSESSMENT QUALITY

The Examination Boards see five levels at which they should execute their obligations:

- A. Safeguarding assessment quality at the **programme level**
- B. Safeguarding assessment quality of **individual study units**
- C. Safeguarding assessment quality of **theses**
- D. Safeguarding quality of **test organisation**
- E. Safeguarding qualifications of **examiners**

CRITERIA FOR SAFEGUARDING ASSESSMENT QUALITY AT EACH LEVEL

The tables below contain the SAQ criteria. To ensure the SAQ protocol is implemented and serves as a mean for continuous learning and improvement, the tables below offer suggestions on:

- Which evidence can be relied on and/or the source(s) of that evidence;
- Which actors may be responsible for collecting the selected evidence;
- When the selected evidence is to be supplied to the Examination Board.

A. Safeguarding assessment quality at the programme level

Criterion	Suggested (source of) evidence	Suggested actor that collects evidence	Suggestion on when is evidence is to be supplied
The Examination Boards checks if the assessment policy meets the criteria and discuss the results with the Programme Directors: all ILOs are tested and tested appropriately (how and when)	Assessment policy Assessment scheme	PMT	April; to discuss for next academic year
All students meet the ILOs			
Quality assessment shows continuous self-learning and improvement of the programme (PDCA-cycle). For example: four-eyes-principle, screening individual test (CELT),.			
The study programme shows clear policy on/for:			
balanced division between individual and group evaluation. this balance is concrete (percentage) and motivated.	Assessment policy: assessment scheme EER / PSA	PMT	April; to discuss for next academic year
balanced division between formative and summative evaluation, this balance is concrete (percentage) and substantiated.	Assessment policy: assessment scheme		
involvement of peer-assessment (when, in which study units, to what extent),the choices are substantiated.	Assessment policy: assessment scheme		
student self-assessment (reflection - when, in which study units, to what extent), the choices are substantiated.	Assessment policy		
transparent policy for prevention of fraud	Assessment policy – which measures taken?		

transparent scheduling of tests, no negative effect of schedules on results	EER Assessment policy Student evaluations		
transparent regulations covering student absence, illness and other mitigating circumstances	EER / PSA		
Progress in assessment methods throughout the program (for ex., progression of open questions tests and multiple choice tests). The choices are substantiated.	Assessment policy: assessment scheme EER / PSA		
Variety of assessment methods. The choices are substantiated.	Assessment policy: assessment scheme EER / PSA		
Monitoring validity, reliability, consistency, transparency in student assessment	Assessment policy – which measures are taken by PMT?		

B. Safeguarding assessment quality of individual study units

Criterion	Suggested (source of) evidence	Suggested actor that collects evidence	Suggestion on when is evidence is to be supplied
Explicit learning goals per study unit that are formulated in a SMART manner	Osiris Syllabus	PMT, may be delegated to: - Module support officer - CELT - Teaching team	- New study unit - Revised study unit - 'Poor' student evaluation (SEQ) - After deep/peer review screening
Transparent connection between learning goals of a study unit and ILOs of a programme	Assessment policy: assessment scheme		
The test is aligned with the specification / format of the study programme	Assessment policy; Syllabus		
Transparent measures for prevention of fraud are applied	Communication to students about: - Use of cover sheet / rules of order) - Use of plagiarism scan Request for online, remote test Green light form thesis: data fabrication		
Published criteria for marking	Canvas Syllabus Cover sheet test		
The calculation of the result is transparent and correct	Formula calculation grade and correction of gambling, on: - Cover sheet - Syllabus - Remindo		

Feedback to students on findings and results of sub-tests and final tests	Roster: when is collective inspection session	Roster team	- 'Poor' student evaluation (SEQ) - Prior to quartile
Repairs for tests are known to students (conditions, when, how)	Syllabus Roster	Roster team PMT, may be delegated to: - Module support officer - CELT - Teaching team	- 'Poor' student evaluation (SEQ) - Prior to quartile - After deep/peer review screening

C. Safeguarding assessment quality of theses

Criterion	Suggested (source of) evidence	Suggested actor that collects evidence	Suggestion on when is evidence is to be supplied
Explicit learning goals of final examinations	Osiris Syllabus	PMT, may be delegated to: - Module support officer - CELT - Teaching team	- New study unit - Revised study unit - 'Poor' student evaluation (SEQ) - After deep/peer review screening
Connection between learning goals of the final exams and ILOs of a programme	Assessment policy: assessment scheme	PMT, may be delegated to: - Module support officer - CELT - Teaching team	- New study unit - Revised study unit - 'Poor' student evaluation (SEQ) - After deep/peer review screening
Validity in relation to learning goals of the final exam	Thesis assessment form	PMT	When (program) ILOs change
Balanced division between process and content-based assessment in the final assessment of the thesis	Thesis assessment form	PMT	When (program) ILOs change
Deviations between initial assessments and re-assessments (screening) afterwards are minimum	(International) thesis carousel	PMT	(Bi-)annually

D. Safeguarding quality of test organisation

Criterion	Suggested (source of) evidence	Suggested actor that collects evidence	Suggestion on when is evidence is to be supplied
Time scheduled for students to prepare for tests	Syllabus Roster	PMT Roster team	'Poor' student evaluation (SEQ)
Conditions for students with special circumstances	UT regulations	Exam Office	April; to discuss for next academic year
Information about tests – where, when, who – is transparent and available to students	Syllabus Canvas Cover sheet	Exam Office / Osiris Key User Roster team PMT Examiners	- Prior to quartile - After deep/peer review screening - 'Poor' student evaluation (SEQ) - Prior to test
Invigilators and examiners are informed about test organisation and fraud prevention	Info package / instructions for invigilators? Info by Exam Office on where, when, who, # of invigilators Info from EB on Rules of Order	Exam Office EBs	April; to discuss for next academic year
Organisation of digital tests	Procedure by e-assessment/CES	CES, by implementing following procedure: E-assessment assigns makes test matrix, organizes Chromebooks,	- Prior to test

		assign students to digital tests Examiner, by filling out form supplied by e-assessment	
In case student assistant works alongside examiner, examiner ensures reliability of assessment	Assessment policy	PMT, checks whether measures are in place (e.g. grade rubric; four eyes principle)	- 'Poor' student evaluation (SEQ) - Prior to test
In case student assistant works alongside examiner, examiner ensures assistant treats test materials and results confidentially	Assessment policy	PMT, checks whether measures are in place (e.g. grade rubric; four eyes principle)	- Prior to test = PMT

E. Safeguarding qualifications of examiners

Criterion	Suggested (source of) evidence	Suggested actor that collects evidence	Suggestion on when is evidence is to be supplied *
Member of the academic staff of the UT In possession of UTQ certificate or equivalent English language proficiency (Standard criteria of the EBs BMS)	List of examiners Signed grade forms Overview of examiners	EBs PMT	Before start academic year = PMT and EB Throughout the academic year = PMT and EB
Examiners in MSc study units hold PhD degree	List of examiners Signed grade forms Overview of examiners	EBs Exam Office	Start academic year = EB Prior to registration of grades in Osiris = Exam Office (checks whether examiner holds relevant degree) End of academic year = PMT
Examiners in BSc study units hold at least MSc or MA degree	List of examiners Signed grade forms Overview of examiners	EBs Exam Office	Start academic year = EB Prior to registration of grades in Osiris = Exam Office (checks whether examiner holds relevant degree) End of academic year = PMT
In thesis committees, at least one of the members holds a PhD degree	Green light form Overview of examiners	EAO (BOZ)	Prior to start of colloquium = EAO (BOZ) End of academic year = PMT

* The “=” sign denotes which actor will evaluate criterion in given circumstances. For instance, in case of a new study unit, CELT checks information / makes evaluation