

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 carrousel | 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 |

| | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>assign students to digital tests</p> <p>Examiner, by filling out form supplied by e-assessment</p> | |
| 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) | <p>- 'Poor' student evaluation (SEQ)</p> <p>- Prior to test</p> |
| 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