*Checklist at programme level*

*Quality assurance and Safeguarding*

*Explanation*

The quality of the assessments and examinations within a study programme must be in good order, for societal and statutory reasons. This requires an assessment policy that has been laid down, communicated, demonstrably implemented and that has the desired and intended effects. It requires structural care at the level of the programme to maintain and improve the quality of assessment and examinations (task and responsibility of the programme management). Legally,
it also requires the supervision and safeguarding actions of an independently operating body: the Examination Board. On this basis, a programme can convincingly guarantee that students who graduate meet the intended final attainment level and are worthy of a UT diploma for a certain programme.

In addition to the programme management and the Examination Boards, there are several actors involved in assessment processes and assessment policy, such as the dean, programme coordinators, examiners, education support staff and, last but not least, the students themselves. Each with their own role and tasks in the whole. Good cooperation is required.

This checklist helps to determine the extent to which 'quality assurance and safeguarding' is already in order. The checklist is not exhaustive or prescriptive. It indicates important areas for attention and is mainly intended to provide a basis for thinking about and discussing what is needed and the forming of ideas about actions and measures. It is a tool to determine what is already in order, to identify possible problem areas and to formulate actions for improvement.

Feel free, as a user, to add items, choose other columns, or adjust the layout and order.

The checklist has been drawn up from the viewpoint of both 'quality assurance' (more related to the tasks and responsibilities of the programme management) and 'safeguarding' (more related to the tasks and responsibilities of the Examination Board). Both checklists are created from a different perspective but at the same time there is an overlap in relevant themes and it might be interesting to check both perspectives and see in which way they are related. In the end, one can say that both bodies work towards the same goals and their tasks and responsibilities cannot be seen separately from each other. The entire system must be in order; actors can look at it and act from different perspectives and authorities but at the same time is it is valuable to know each other's perspective and approaches.

*It is recommended to fill in this checklist and to discuss it with other actors and bodies involved in assessment and examination. It is precisely the discussions about this that lead to (new) insights and supported points of action. For an overview of roles, tasks and responsibilities of actors involved in assessment policy please consult the appendix of the UT Assessment framework.*

*-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------*

The original instrument was developed as part of the project: "Implementation UT Framework Assessment Policy" 2014.

In later years, revisions took place and in 2021 the English version was created.
For questions or reactions: *W.D.J. (Helma) Vlas,* *w.d.j.vlas@utwente.nl**; +31 53 489 6915*Checklist: Perspective Quality assurance
Roles, tasks and responsibilities of the Programme Management

The checklist below has 3 columns for description:

**In order? Y/M/?** Means: Is this item complied with? A "?" can be used when it is not known or when there are doubts. A corresponding action will then usually be to start with consulting other persons or bodies for this point, to examine documentation and to investigate further.

**Functional Y/N/?** Means: does it also work well in practice? For example, is it well described (in order), but teachers are not very familiar with it or it is not acted upon. This column sometimes provides extra information or insight.

Below each topic table, points of attention and actions can be indicated. Including who should be involved in addressing this point or when working on suggested improvements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A) Conditional issues | In order? Y/N/? |
| A1 | The intended learning outcomes on programme level (PILO’s; final qualifications) are clearly formulated, provide an insight into what the programme stands for, are in line with requirements from the Dutch (NVAO) and international qualification structure (BA or MA level; Dublin Descriptors), domain-specific requirements and the requirements from relevant professional working areas.  |  |
| A2 | The PILO’s are translated into learning pathways and/or learning objectives for the various curriculum components. It is clear how the curriculum, in terms of design and structure, contributes to the realisation of the PILO’s.  |  |
| A3 | The learning objectives for education units (possibly also subsections) are formulated in a clear manner (according to prevailing methods, SMART) and give a clear, insightful impression of what will be learned and students will be able to.  |  |
| A4 | There is a vision on education for the education programme, related to the UT vision on education.  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Point of attention / required action: Who is/are involved?  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| B) Established documented assessment policy  | In order Y/N/? |
| B1 | The programme has documented the assessment policy (assessment policy plan) at faculty and/or programme level. This policy plan addresses most of the following points (C-F) and describes what is done to ensure the quality of assessment and examinations.  |  |
| B2 | The policy is evaluated and adjusted at fixed moments (e.g. annually) and new ambitions or ways of working are added. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Point of attention / required action: Who is/are involved?  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| C) Vision on assessment and examination  | In order?Y/N/? | Func-tionalY/N/? |
| C1 | There is a documented vision on assessment and examination in line with the educational vision. If possible, this has been worked out in principles and guidelines for those involved. Specific areas of attention or ambitions have been named. Points of attention. The vision on among others: * Function of assessment (qualification, formative and summative, feedback, assessment to promote the learning process, etc.); possible special purposes, such as assessment as a means to support the advising and selecting function of the propaedeutic phase.
* Assessment methods to be used, the diversity thereof, group and individual assessment methods, digital assessment, etc. The most important criteria fort the choice of assessment methods.
* Scheduling of assessments (number, planning, spread, re-sits); programmatic assessment (based on learning path’s).
* The role of the examiners (academic freedom, professionalism, continuous improvement et al.).
 |  |  |
| C2 | Within the study programme, attention is paid to new developments in the field of assessment, e.g. digital assessment, different types of assessment, new views on assessment, etc. There are opportunities for teachers to experiment.  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Point of attention / required action: Who is/are involved?  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| D) Assessment organization**[[1]](#footnote-1)**; rules, procedures, protocols | In orderY/N/? | Func-tional?Y/N/? |
| *Explanation: Are the following matters properly regulated? I.e.: is there a policy or are there established procedures or arrangements for this? Does the policy, procedure, or processes work in practice, functional (is it known, is it properly implemented, does it have the desired effect, etc)?*  |
| D1 | There is an EER (OER) available at the level of the programme (may consist of an institutional and/or faculty part and a programme-specific part). The EER complies with the applicable legal guidelines (WHW article 7.13) and contains clear, unequivocal information on the programme or group of programmes. |  |  |
| D2 | There are Rules & Guidelines of the Examination Board. These can be easily located by examiners and students (and others) and are known at least to the examiners.  |  |  |
| D3 | For each unit of study (and parts where relevant), it is laid down how assessments are carried out and assessed (test schedules, including information on re-sits and repairs).  |  |  |
| There are protocols and guidelines regarding the following issues:  |
| D3 | * preventing and dealing with fraud/plagiarism;
 |  |  |
| D4 | * administering written tests (including invigilation; guidelines for digital testing);
 |  |  |
| D5 | * administration and communication of test results. Are the data kept safe and long stored safely and for long enough?
 |  |  |
| D6 | * archiving of work done (written tests, assignments, etc.)? There is sufficient attention for security, safekeeping period. Specific point of attention: archiving of graduation work;
 |  |  |
| D7 | * digital or online testing;
 |  |  |
| D8 | * measures for students with disabilities when test are taken and regarding during testing and examination in general;
 |  |  |
| D9 | * what to do if students indicate that they are unable to attend a test or do hand in work due to illness, personal circumstances, etc.
 |  |  |
| D10 | * ways for students to submit complaints and objections (also known to students) and the steps to be taken if complaints are submitted.
 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D11 | The method of assessment, the moment (timetable) and the way to register are known in good time to the students and other relevant actors.  |  |  |
| D12 | The organization of assessment and examination (partly by means of the used systems) is well organised. Here one can think of all other organisational matters that play a role, such as: registration and deregistration for tests,; room reservations; the care for copies of tests, etc.  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Point of attention / required action: Who is/are involved?  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| E) Roles, tasks, responsibilities and authorisations | In order?Y/N/? |
| Explanation: there are many actors and bodies involved in testing and examining. Think for example of: dean / education portfolio holder || programme director || programme coordinator || quality assurance officer || faculty educationalist || module coordinator || graduation supervisor/assessor || study advisor || lecturer / examiner || phd / student assistant deployed for education || BOZ / examination office || invigilators || e-learning specialists || Examination Board || Programme committee || CBE / CHBO and not to forget the students self.  |
| E1 | The roles, tasks, responsibilities and authorities are clear and documented for the actors and bodies involved in assessment and examination. The mutual relations and the way of co-ordination are clear. The roles, tasks etc. are written down, communicated, known and accepted.. |  |
| E2 | Everyone acts in accordance with the powers, responsibilities, roles and tasks. (Are there bottlenecks? Uncertainties? Disputes about roles and responsibilities?)  |  |
| E3 | Those involved have the appropriate competencies to properly carry out their roles, tasks and responsibilities.  |  |
| E4 | There is adequate coordination and, where relevant, cooperation between the parties involved, particularly between the bodies (programme management versus Examination Board; Examination Board versus programme committee, etc.). Bottlenecks in coordination or cooperation are identified at an early stage and addressed constructively. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Point of attention / required action: Who is/are involved?  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| F) Assessment competences or literacy (verifiable)  | In order? Y/N/? |
| F1 | The examiners are demonstrably competent in the field of assessment. This is evident from...? (E.g. UTQ, attended course Testing & Assessment, completed assessment screening, etc.). |  |
| F2 | The assessors of graduation projects are demonstrably competent for this task.  |  |
| F3 | The examiners are able to deliver the required documentation and provide the requested information for instance for an assessment screening or a dossier. They are able to give an account of their way of testing and assessing.  |  |
| F4 | Te teachers/examiners are familiar with the EER (OER), R&R of the Examination Board, manuals about testing and assessment (if available), relevant protocols etc. The rules are sufficiently followed in practice.  |  |
| F5 | The teachers/examiners are familiar with the quality criteria for assessment and know how to apply them to test construction and assessing assignments and written test results (paying attention to validity, reliability, transparency), e.g. by making answer models, drawing up an assessment specification table and constructing assessment criteria or a rubric for assessing the submitted work for assignments.  |  |
| F6 | The examiners make use of the input of peers for test construction and/or assessing work.  |  |
| F7 | The examiners are able to calculate grades based on scores in an appropriate way (determining the cut-off point, using the adequate formula for calculating grades, taking the guessing factor into account when working with MC tests , etc.).  |  |
| F8 | The teachers/examiners understand the importance of analysing and evaluating the results of an assessment afterwards (student results analysis; item analysis, analysis regarding the scores on criteria, student evaluations). Both for the purpose of identifying possible incorrections in the assessment and adjusting the grading accordingly and for evaluating the quality of the assessment and the education offered for future improvement. |  |
| F9 | There is support for examiners if they have questions regarding assessment issues. For example questions about online assessment or the construction of questions. The examiners are aware of this and make use of it if necessary.  |  |
| F10 | The teachers take part in training activities in the field of assessment. E.g. courses, theme sessions, education days. They keep themselves informed of new developments.  |  |
| F11 | \* If PHDs or teaching assistants are deployed for assessments (including graduation projects): The PHDs or teaching assistants are well prepared for their task. There is supervision on the execution by a responsible examiner.  |  |
| Point of attention / required action: Who is/are involved?  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| G) Quality assurance and safeguarding activities.  | In order?Y/N/? | Functio-nal?Y/N/? |
| G1 | Explicit (also documented) attention is paid to the care for and assurance of the quality of assessment and examination in the study programme. The PDCA cycle is followed.  |  |  |
| G2 | The programme can account for the way in which the assessment takes place and the quality of the assessment. It can demonstrate, through documentation and practice, that it complies with legal requirements and is well prepared for accreditation on programme and institution level.  |  |  |
| G3 | There is a positive 'culture of assessment' or one that is in the making. The theme get a lot of attention. *Explanation: the importance of paying continuous attention to promoting and monitoring the quality of assessment and examination is generally acknowledged. The theme 'assessment' (policy, assessment programme, organization, quality, innovative assessment methods etc.) is regularly discussed in various consultation situations within the programme (programme committee, chair groups, teams etc.).*  |  |  |
| Measures and provisions have been taken for quality assurance and quality control in order to promote and improve in a continuous way the quality of assessment and examinations and to guarantee the attainment of the final qualifications (PILO’s).  |
| G4 | >> on curriculum level. Think for instance of:* A regularly check on the set-up and up-to-datedness of the assessment programme (assessment and examination in relation to the PILO’s and learning objectives for education units or subjects; with explicit learning pathways (learning lines) and description of assessment methods).

*Are all the PILO’s still covered? Can the attainment of the final qualifications still be guaranteed? Do the assessment methods still fit in with the vision on education and assessment?*  |  |  |
| G5 | >> on the level of an education unit or subject based on quality enhancing and monitoring  measures. Such as continuous attention to, among other things:* guaranteed competence of examiners (measures if competence is not known, is lacking or if someone does not function well as an examiner);
* clear guidelines for setting up, administering, assessing and analysing/evaluating assessments;
* assessment aspects in student evaluations (NSE etc.)
* the way complaints are dealt with;
* the use of measures to assure the quality of assessments, like assessment screenings;

Point of attention: Do the measures taken give confidence that students are assessed in an appropriate manner? That if the quality of assessment is inadequate, this will be noticed and measures will be taken? |  |  |
| G6 | >> with regard to graduation projects and internships; based on for instance:* calibration sessions
* clear guidelines for supervision
* protocols for assessing the work (when more assessors are involved)
* tools (criteria, rubrics) for assessing the work
* thesis carousels
* exit interviews
* external validation (e.g. clients, employer panel, alumni survey)
 |  |  |
| G7 | Structural activities are undertaken to check whether graduates meet the aimed for level. For example, through fieldwork research, panel discussions, external evaluation of the quality of graduation projects, etc.  |  |  |
| G8 | For each education unit (possibly for each component), afterwards the assessment itself, the means to determine the score/grades (answer model, criteria, rubric; the way the conversion from scores to grades is done) and the student results are available, justified and archived. So that these data can be retrieved and checked whenever needed (assessment dossier).  |  |  |
| Point of attention / required action: Who is/are involved?  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Checklist: Perspective: Safeguarding
Roles, tasks and responsibilities of the Examination Board

Starting point: Every study programme or group of programmes has an Examination Board (EB). Tasks, responsibilities and competences of an Examination Board are laid down by law. The dean is ultimately responsible for the functioning of the EB (members).

NB. In the current administrative set-up for the faculties of the UT, the faculty education portfolio holder or vice dean fulfils many of the tasks of the dean. Wherever the following text refers to the Dean, it should also be read as referring to the vice dean.

The checklist below has 3 columns for description:

**In order? Y/M/?** Means: Is this item complied with? A "?" can be used when it is not known or when there are doubts. A corresponding action will then usually be to start with consulting other persons or bodies for this point, to examine documentation and to investigate further.

**Functional Y/N/?** Means: does it also work well in practice? For example, is it well described (in order), but teachers are not very familiar with it or it is not acted upon. This column sometimes provides extra information or insight.

Below each topic table, points of attention and actions can be indicated. Including who should be involved in addressing this point or when working on suggested improvements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EC1) Support and conditions for the proper functioning of the Examination Board.** | In order?Y/N/? |
| EC1a | The Examination Board members have been heard by the dean (check on expertise, among other things) and have been formally appointed.  |  |
| EC1b | It is clear for how long an appointment is or can be. What the options are for reappointment. |  |
| EC1c | The dean keeps an eye on the adequate and independent functioning of the EB and whether they are in a position to do so. The dean discusses the Annual Report. The dean takes measures when the board or individual members do not function properly.  |  |
| EC1d | The development of expertise of EB members is encouraged and facilitated.  |  |
| EC1e | There are sufficient resources and possibilities for advice and support on issues. Within the programme/faculty and/or within the institution and/or outside. For example, support with legal questions.  |  |
| EC1f | The EB members are facilitated in the form of time allowance or exemption from other duties.  |  |
| EC1g | The EB is facilitated by secretarial support (official secretary / registry 1; in Dutch: ambtelijke secretaris / griffier).  |  |
| EC1h | The Examination Board receives sufficient cooperation from the programme management and education support staff (e.g. study advisors) to be able to carry out their work properly.  |  |
| Concerns and key points for action: Who is/are involved? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EC2) Functioning of the Examination Board**  | In order? Y/N/? |
| EC2a | The Examination Board members are (demonstrably) competent and are capable of fulfilling their (specific) role in the board There is sufficient expertise within the group, for instance knowledge of the field of study and the programme (if possible the professional field), knowledge of laws and regulations and assessment expertise.  |  |
| EC2b | There is at least one member with specific knowledge of the study programme, who is also attached to the study programme as a teacher (statutory requirement). |  |
| EC2c | There is one external member (statutory requirement). His/her role is clear. |  |
| EC2d | The EB (members) themselves regularly take action to foster their own expertise. By for instance participating in courses (SUEQ, Testing & Assessment etc.), by exchanging knowledge and good practice with other boards, by attending the Platform EB meetings (for the chairmen), by keeping up to date with developments in legislation and regulations etc.  |  |
| EC2e | There is a internal regulation document (or rules of procedure. Dutch: huishoudelijk reglement) for the EB in which matters are laid down such as: composition of the board, how members are elected, working methods in decision-making, etc.  |  |
| EC2f | It is established (in the Rules & Regulations and/or internal regulations) who within the examination board is authorized to take which type of decision. Mandates are described.  |  |
| EC2g | An annual report is drawn up. This report provides insight into and justifies the activities undertaken and decisions made. Important points of attention are identified. The report is discussed with the Dean. |  |
| EC2h | Decisions are adequately archived. Case law (Dutch: jurisprudentie) is built up.  |  |
| EC2i | The EB reacts timely and adequately to requests and complaints. There are guidelines for this, e.g. in terms of lead time for handling and mandating. These own guidelines are properly followed. There is appropriate communication with those involved. When dealing with cases, the following applies in any case: - application of the adversarial procedure (Dutch: hoor en wederhoor);- if the examiner is also a member of the EB, he/she does not take part in the handling of the complaint.  Conflicts of interest are prevented;- clear communication towards those involved (e.g. those involved are kept informed of the progress;  there is feedback on the decision to all involved; decisions are clearly substantiated). - proper archiving of processes and documents. |  |
| EC2j | There is regular contact with the study programme management and the dean, e.g. to properly align responsibilities, to discuss bottlenecks, to discuss plans and stimulating actions, to align assurance actions with safeguard actions, etc.  |  |
| EC2k | The excel maintains contact with other committees and relevant bodies or persons within the study programme (when relevant also at faculty or institution level) to foster the proper functioning of (cooperation) processes and to inform itself. For example with the Programme Committee; study advisors; Examination Office, Bureau of Educational Affairs (BOZ).  |  |
| EC2l | The EB advises the programme management proactively and on request about assessment policy, assessment programme, assessment vision and other issues important to the programme concerning (the quality of) assessment and assessment policy.  |  |
| EC2m | The EB self is vigilant in its continued independent functioning, as indicated by law.  |  |
| Concerns and key points for action: Who is/are involved? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EC3) (Statutory) Tasks and responsibilities of the Examination Board**  | In order? Y/N/? |
| EC3a | Rules and Guidelines (R&G; statutory requirement) have been drawn up (document) for assessing assessments and examinations and for determining the results. Aligned with the Education & Examination Regulations (EER) for a (group of) study programmes. [Dutch: Regels en Richtlijnen R&R in overeenstemming met de OER.]At least the statutory (WHW) specified areas of concern have been addressed. |  |
| EC3b | Specific point of attention:> There are rules and guidelines for granting exemptions for taking one or more exams. These have  been laid down. When deviating from the standard rules, the EB decides. When granting an  exemption, the reasons are clearly explained and the decisions are archived.> The decisions regarding the granting of permission to a student to follow a free education  programme, leading to a degree, are well-considered. There are guidelines for this. The decisions  are archived.  |  |
| EC3c | The Rules and Guidelines are explicitly brought to the attention and are easy to find and understandable for those involved in assessment, especially for the examiners.  |  |
| EC3d | Monitoring of compliance with the R&G within the study programme is carried out.  |  |
| EC3d | The EB provides annual advice on the EER (NB. This is not a statutory task, but it helps to align expectations and avoid problems due to different views afterwards.). |  |
| EC3e | The EB is aware of and adequately carries out the following tasks:- awarding of the certificate, with diploma supplement;- issuing a statement of examinations passed, if a degree certificate cannot be issued. |  |
| EC3f | Examiners are explicitly appointed by the Examination Bboard each year (or fora n indication period). Profiles and criteria have been drawn up for this purpose. The names of those appointed are documented and archived. Those involved are informed of this appointment.  |  |
| EC3g | The EB checks whether there is an adequate fraud policy (can also assist to draw this up). Compliance with the policy is monitored. Fraud cases are brought before the EB. The EB takes adequate measures when fraud occurs. |  |
| Concerns and key points for action: Who is/are involved? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EC4) ( Statutory) Comprehensive safeguarding tasks**  | In order? Y/N/? |
| EC4a | The statutory task of the Examination Board is to determine, in an objective and expert manner, whether a student meets the conditions set by the education and examination regulations with regard to the knowledge, insight and skills required to obtain a degree. Does the examination board structurally fulfil this role? Are actions taken? What is being done to fulfil this role? Can it be proven that every student who has graduated meets the requirements? Is it clear what the task of the programme is and what the task of the EB is in this respect?  |  |
| EC4b | The statutory task of the Examination Board is to safeguard the quality of assessments (module, subject level) and examinations. Does the board structurally fulfil this role? What is being done to achieve this task?Is there sufficient insight into the quality of assessments? Can it be substantiated that the quality is in order? Does the programme management take sufficient measures to promote, control and monitor quality? Is it clear what the task of the programme management is and what the task of the EB is in this respect? Options for safeguarding are, for example: advising the programme management on the assessment policy it has drawn up; evaluating the assessment programme (documented assessment plan on programme level); evaluating assessment plans on module or subject level; checking the way in which final graduate projects are assessed and the provide grades; checking the quality of assessments or monitoring the way in which the quality of assessments is promoted and verified; taking measures in the case of examiner dysfunction or poor quality of assessments.  |  |
| EC4c | The task of the EB is to guarantee the quality of the organization and the procedures surrounding assessments and examination. Does the EB structurally fulfil this role? What is being done for the benefit of this task? Is it clear what belongs to the responsibility and tasks of the programme management and what is the responsibility and task of the EB in this regard?  |  |
| Concerns and key points for action: Who is/are involved? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

---------------------------

*1)* Official secretaries or the registry support Examination Boards of a faculty or programme in secretarial, procedural and legal matters. The secretary / registrar takes care of the preparation, reporting and finalization of the decisions, keeps track of the annual planning and updates the archives of the Examination Board. The official secretary creates the conditions for a thorough quality assurance of the assessment by the examination boards, by taking over the organizational and secretarial tasks of the examination board. The official secretary also checks (proposed) decisions against the regulations, contributes to the development of uniform procedures and represents the board of examiners in various consultations and appeal procedures.

If there are several official secretaries working for a faculty, for instance, the work of Examination Boards and the official secretariat can be organized in such a way that the various official secretaries can take over each other's work, thus ensuring continuity. *\* Text based on the explanation on* [Ambtelijk secretariaat examencommissie - Universiteit Leiden](https://www.organisatiegids.universiteitleiden.nl/faculteiten-en-instituten/geesteswetenschappen/faculteitsbureau/onderwijs--en-studentzaken/ambtelijk-secretariaat-examencommissie)

 **Extra notes**

1. In this checklist assessment organization refers to: (1) the way in which lecturers/examiners, Examination Boards, programme management and supporting staff cooperate purposefully, in good harmony and effectively with each other in order to ensure and guarantee the quality of assessment. This concerns the way in which roles, tasks, responsibilities and authorities are divided and fulfilled in practice. (2) Policies, procedures and/or regulations which are in place around assessment processes. For example, is the way written tests are administered properly organised, including the guidelines and procedures for surveying? [↑](#footnote-ref-1)