# Plan of approach on SUEQ

### Rachel Scott 13th October 2023

As a programme coordinator, my awareness of challenges surrounding the examination review process stemmed from direct interactions with examiners, students, and teachers encountering various concerns during these assessments. Initially, my focus was on addressing immediate issues, yet it was only after a considerable period that I recognized the absence of standardised guidelines might underlie inconsistencies across faculties and programmes at UT.

My further investigation demanded a methodical and comprehensive approach.

I undertook extensive discussions with diverse stakeholders to gain an understanding of their needs. The choice of stakeholders was deliberate, encompassing a mix of firsthand experiences and expert insights. I spoke with ten examiners across four different sections covering multiple programmes to hear about their experience of the examination review. Engaging with ten examiners from multiple programmes and four IBA students offered firsthand accounts that shed light on the various challenges encountered by the different groups, while discussions with two other programme coordinators broadened the perspective.

I looked extensively at the existing guidelines available at the UT and legal frameworks. These documents served as foundational resources, enabling a comprehensive understanding of existing frameworks and identifying areas where information was lacking:

* Education and Examination Regulations of the BMS faculty 2023-2024
* Rules & Guidelines of the Examination Board of the BMS faculty 2023-2024
* BMS protocol Safeguarding Assessment Quality 2023
* UT protocol Rules of Order for Written Tests 2018
* UT Quality Assurance Framework Student Assessment 2016
* BMS Policy Plan on Quality of Education 2019
* I also looked at documentation from other universities including Maastricht and Groningen to broaden the scope of analysis and establish potential best practices
* I used the law as stated in the WHW regarding this topic (01/10/2023)

After undertaking a thorough review of the available guidelines I came to the conclusion that there was very little stated in the guidelines regarding the examination review; and very little in the way of best practice that had been established at the other universities in the Netherlands. I then received feedback from the chair of the examination board and a member of the registry. I also discussed the topic with the central EER working group of the UT which included members from all but one of the faculties at the UT. These discussions provided invaluable insights into planned changes and, offered clarity on implementation strategies and aligning proposed changes effectively within the UT's regulatory framework. I learned that the UT is exploring methods to broaden the scope of opportunities for conducting examination reviews, specifically the use of online options.

After looking at the existing policies and protocols in place at the UT, or not in place. I decided to follow the approach of the UT’s Written Order for Written Tests. I have formulated my advice to establish a protocol rather than a policy based on this model. I also believe that the examination review could serve as an addendum to this already-established protocol.

I strategically aligned the proposed protocol with the UT assessment policy in assigning clear roles and responsibilities to various actors such as the UC-E, Strategy and Policy Department, Examination Boards, programmes, examiners, students, and CES, ensuring accountability and effective implementation.

The proposed protocol was designed in alignment with the Quality of Assessment Pyramid, ensuring coherence with assessment policies, examination competence, and organisational aspects. This integration was crucial in maintaining alignment with the assessment policy of the UT and BMS.

The resources utilised provided a comprehensive understanding of the issue, ensuring that the proposed advice aligned with legal frameworks, educational policies and procedures, and stakeholder needs.