Quality Assurance Code of Practice

Assessment, Marking and Feedback

1. Purpose and Scope

1.1 This statement sets out principles and procedures relating to the design and development of assessment and feedback strategies, the setting and marking of assessments, and the evaluation and monitoring of assessment and feedback practice.

1.2 The principles and procedures relate to all taught programmes of study leading to an award of the University.

1.3 The procedures may be varied under the terms of an Institutional Agreement where a programme of study is delivered as a collaborative initiative with a partner institution.

1.4 This statement should be read in conjunction with:

QA3 Approval of New Programmes of Study;
QA4 Amendments to Programmes of Study and Units and Approval of New Units;
QA12 External Examining (Taught Programmes);
QA13 Degree Scheme Reviews;
QA28 Conduct of Examinations;QA53 Examination and Assessment Offences.

The University’s Education Strategy and the New Framework for Assessment should also be referred to.

2. Principles

2.1 The University is committed to ensuring that:

- it has effective procedures for:
  - designing, approving, monitoring and reviewing appropriate assessment and feedback strategies for units and programmes;
  - implementing rigorous assessment and feedback policies and practices, ensuring that the standard for each award and award element is set and maintained at the appropriate level, and that student performance is properly judged against this;
  - evaluating how academic standards are maintained through assessment practice;
- everyone involved in the assessment of students understands and is effective in undertaking their roles and responsibilities;

---

1 These principally incorporate, with some adaptations, UK Quality Code Chapter B6: Assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning
• information and guidance on assessment is clear, accurate and accessible to all relevant parties including students, assessors and external examiners;
• assessment practice promotes effective learning by providing appropriate and effective formative assessment and feedback opportunities;
• the amount and timing of assessment enables effective and appropriate measurement of students’ achievement of intended learning outcomes;
• academic assessment practices permit a diverse student body to demonstrate the achievement of learning outcomes and competence standards;
• students are encouraged to adopt good academic conduct in respect of assessment and are aware of their responsibilities;
• mechanisms for marking and moderating are transparent and fair, such that students and markers are aware of and understand the assessment criteria and any grade descriptors that will be used to mark each assessment task;
• assessment decisions are recorded and documented accurately and systematically and that the decisions of examination boards are communicated in a timely manner;
• students are provided with appropriate and timely feedback on assessed work in a way that promotes learning and facilitates improvement but does not increase the burden of assessment;
• assessment is conducted with rigour, probity and fairness, and with due regard for security.

3. Definitions

Assessment: any process that appraises a student’s knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills.

Summative assessments are defined within approved schemes of studies to test the achievement of learning outcomes. They are assessments used to determine progression, or eligibility for an award.

Formative assessments are not defined in approved schemes of studies but contribute to the student's learning experience. (Note: in some instances assessment may be both formative and summative. For example, a component of assessment submitted during a unit may be summative in the sense that it contributes to the final mark for the unit, but may also be formative in the sense that it helps students to improve their performance in subsequent assessments in the same unit.)

Anonymous marking: the identity of students is not revealed to markers. To protect both staff and students from bias and the perception of bias, the University has adopted a principle of employing anonymous marking, where practical, on all summative assessment.

Assessment criteria: the knowledge, understanding and skills markers expect a student to display in the assessment task and which are taken into account in marking the work, based on the learning outcomes being assessed.

Checking of marking: ensuring that all the output of a candidate has been assessed eg. no answers are overlooked by examiners and scores are correctly aggregated.

2 These definitions are based upon those included in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education Part B Chapter 6 Appendix 2, Assessment of Students and Recognition of Prior Learning, and/or the University’s New New Framework for Assessment – Assessment Regulations (NFAAR)
Double marking: student work is independently assessed by more than one marker. Double marking is blind where the second marker, when assessing the work, does not have access to the comments or grades/marks of the first marker.

Assessment feedback: any indication or information provided to students about their performance in an assessment.

Grade descriptors: indications of levels of achievement required in relation to bands of marks.

Marking scheme: a detailed framework for assigning marks, where a specific number of marks is given to individual components of the answer.

Model answer: the assessor's explicit view of what an answer to an assessment task should contain.

Moderation of assessment tasks: a process intended to assure that a proposed assessment task is consistent with the unit description currently in force, tests the learning outcomes accurately and fairly, and is capable of fairly and effectively differentiating levels of student achievement where required.

Moderation of marking: a process intended to assure that marking is of an appropriate and consistent standard, taking into account any marking criteria, marking schemes/model answers, and grade descriptors. Forms of moderation include:
- sampling;
- additional marking, for example of borderlines, firsts and fails, or where there is significant difference between the marks of different markers that cannot be resolved without the opinion of another marker;
- review of marks where there is a significant difference between several assessment marks, within or between parts of a programme, which indicate the marks may need to be reconsidered.

Significant contribution: all work contributing 7% or more towards the degree classification.

Supplementary assessment: a further assessment for a particular unit, which may involve, for example, retaking an examination, submitting a new piece of coursework or undertaking some other form of work.

4. Roles and Responsibilities

4.1 Heads of Departments/School/the Learning Partnerships Office (LPO) are responsible for ensuring that these procedures are followed for all programmes of study within the Department/School/LPO that lead to an award of the University of Bath and that they are articulated clearly within the Department/School/LPO.

Heads of Departments/School/LPO are also responsible for:
- ruling on the requirements and application of anonymity;
- the appointment of third markers where required;
- identifying internal moderators for units;
- determining the forms of internal moderation to be used; and
- determining whether students may be given access to examination scripts.
4.2 Heads of Department and Directors of Administration are responsible for
   • identifying appropriate resources for ensuring the timely processing and approval of
     assessment marks
   • ensuring the setting of all assessments takes place in a timely way including, where
     required, the involvement of the External Examiner(s) (see QA12 External Examing
     (Taught Programmes)).

4.3 Faculty/School/ Learning Teaching and Quality Committees are responsible for approving:
   • Department/School generic grade descriptors covering the classifications for
     undergraduate and taught postgraduate awards
   • Department/School policies for feedback on assessed work; and
   • Department/School strategies for sampling of work to be put through Turnitin or similar
     plagiarism-detection systems (see QA53).

4.4 Department Learning Teaching and Quality Committees are responsible for proposing and
   reviewing the policies/strategies referred to in 4.3 above;

4.5 Directors of Studies are responsible for:
   • working with and supporting Unit Convenors in discharging their responsibilities (see 4.6
     below);
   • considering and determining requests for coursework extensions;
   • ensuring that students receive appropriate academic counselling to support their decisions
     at key points during their studies;
   • ensuring that there are sufficient mechanisms in place to identify and counsel students
     whose academic performance is giving cause for concern; and
   • monitoring and developing assessment and feedback strategies at programme-level.

4.6 Unit Convenors are responsible (in consultation, where appropriate, with Directors of Studies)
   for the setting and marking of and feedback on unit assessments in accordance with the
   requirements and expectations of this statement.

ASSESSMENT

5. Assessment Strategies

Summative assessment

5.1 The summative assessment regime for each programme will be set at the point of programme
   approval, with the detail recorded in the individual unit descriptions comprising the programme
   (see QA3).

5.2 Subsequently, the assessment regime may change as the assessment for individual units is
   amended under the procedure set out in QA4. This could be in response, for example, to the
   outcomes of unit and/or programme annual monitoring, quinquennial Degree Scheme Review,
   the changing requirements of professional regulatory or statutory bodies, enhancement
   initiatives at University/ Faculty/ School/ LPO/ Department level, external examiner advice or
   other similar factors. The assessment regime of programmes may also develop as a result of
   units being withdrawn and new units being approved (see QA4).
5.3 In approving a programme’s initial summative assessment regime, and also for the purpose of approving any subsequent changes to it, the following factors should be taken into account where relevant, and as far as is practicable:

- the assessment method(s) for each unit should have the capacity to test the relevant learning outcomes accurately and fairly, and differentiate between levels of student performance;
- assessment methods should be appropriate to the subject being studied, the mode of learning, and to the students taking the unit or programme;
- students should experience a range of assessment methods, including methods that encourage them to reflect and synthesise learning from different parts of their programme;
- assessment methods should be efficient and excessive amounts of summative assessment should be avoided;
- the amount of summative assessment by means of groupwork should be proportionate to the aims and learning outcomes of the programme;
- the University has adopted a principle of anonymous marking, where practical.

Formative assessment

5.4 The provision of appropriate formative assessment and feedback opportunities can significantly enhance the learning experience and development of students, and their performance in summative assessment.

5.5 Accordingly, there is a requirement that every unit should include at least one formative assessment and feedback opportunity, subject to a waiver for individual units where approved by the relevant Associate Dean/Assistant Dean/Head of Learning Partnerships on the advice of the relevant School/Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, and after consultation with students. In units where the summative assessment regime comprises more than one item of assessment, the earlier piece(s) of summative assessment may fulfil this expectation.

Good Practice – examples of formative assessment and feedback

- Feedback on assignment plans, assignment drafts (whole class or individual)
- Feedback on lab practicals and lab report
- Responses/exchanges using wikis and distance learning resources
- Activities on Moodle that encourage students to reflect upon their reading/work with feedback from tutors (and sometimes peers)
- MCQs on paper or in Moodle to check understanding with class feedback

5.6 Formative assessment opportunities are not recorded in unit descriptions and may therefore be easily changed and developed. However, they should be reported and evaluated as appropriate as part of the Annual Monitoring of Units (see QA51).

---

3 These factors principally comprise elements of guidance from the UK Quality Code for Higher Education; Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and Recognition of Prior Learning (Indicator 6).
6. Setting of summative assessment tasks

6.1 The assessment regime for each unit may be found - broadly defined - in the relevant unit description.

6.2 A unit’s assessment regime may comprise one or more components, and should assess all the unit learning outcomes.

6.3 For the purpose of this statement, the term coursework includes all assessments which are not conducted under formal examination conditions.

6.4 Unit Convenors are responsible for setting pieces of assessment that are original, fully consistent with the unit description currently in force, and test the learning outcomes accurately and fairly. Any changes to a unit’s assessment regime must be first formally approved under the procedures set out in QA4.

6.5 Unit convenors are also responsible for ensuring that assessment tasks are capable of fairly and effectively differentiating levels of student achievement, including exceptional ability and therefore, other than in pass/fail assessments, grade criteria can be used to differentiate between students’ performance.

6.6 Where a unit is assessed by group work and makes a significant contribution to the final classification, the Unit Convenor must ensure that the assessment is devised in such a way that includes an element of individual assessment and the boundary between cooperation and collusion is made clear to students at the outset. Setting an assessment which only entails a mean mark being awarded to all members of the group will not normally be appropriate. Similarly individual feedback should be provided where appropriate.

6.7 All summative examination papers and summative assessment tasks should be moderated internally.

6.8 All summative examination papers, should be sent, with clear marking criteria and model answers/markng schemes appropriate to the discipline, to external examiners for moderation. Other summative assessment tasks that make a significant contribution to a final award, should also be sent, with clear marking criteria and model answers/markng schemes appropriate to the discipline, to external examiners for moderation. These requirements apply equally to orals/presentations (see QA12 and the External Examiners' Handbook).

6.9 Students should normally receive the following information on an assessment task:
   • the weighting that the assessment task carries in the overall assessment of the unit;
   • the assessment criteria, and any relevant grading criteria.
   • the timing, nature and extent of feedback they can expect and whether this is to be accompanied by the return of assessed work.

   Where an assessment task comprises coursework students should, in addition, receive information on:
   • the assessment task(s);
   • the word limit/range, and the penalty for non-compliance. If a penalty policy is not stated in writing the University default policy will apply (see paragraph 10 below);
   • any specific requirements of professional, regulatory or statutory bodies;
   • any special presentation or referencing preferences/requirements;
• the date for submission of the work;
• the dates when any further detailed information about the individual task(s) will be communicated and how they will be communicated;
• the timing, nature and extent of feedback that students can expect and whether this is to be accompanied by the return of assessed work.

Unit Convenors may also, where appropriate, wish to remind students of the penalties for late submission of assessments and provide a warning regarding plagiarism and other academic offences. All assessed coursework must be accompanied by a declaration from the student that the work is their own and that any re-use of their own work, or use of the work of others, is referenced appropriately.

6.10 Where it is proposed that assessment be conducted in a language(s) other than that used for teaching and/or study, advice should be sought from the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Office.

7. Deadlines for submission of assessed work and penalties

7.1 Coursework submission dates and time deadlines should be set by Unit Convenors in consultation with relevant Directors of Studies and after taking into account, so far as is reasonably practicable, the following: ⁴
- submission dates should be at appropriate points, taking into account the organisation and delivery of the curriculum, and the desirability of providing students with an opportunity to reflect on their learning;
- avoiding clashes and excessive assessment burdens for students and staff;
- ensuring that those involved in marking student work have enough time to complete it satisfactorily in light of the date at which the results are required, either by the student or the institution;
- in the case of work to be sent by distance learners in different time zones, the practicalities of access to the internet for such students.

7.2 Coursework submission dates and time deadlines should be clearly publicised at the beginning of the unit, and where practicable, in the student handbook, showing how they relate to one another and to the overall assessment, where appropriate.

⁴ These factors incorporate elements of guidance from the UK Quality Code for Higher Education; Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and Recognition of Prior Learning (Indicator 6)
8. Requests for extensions and penalties for late coursework

8.1 Requests for extensions (QA16 form 1) should be submitted by a student to the Director of Studies for consideration in cases where the majority of units are based within one Department/School. Where this is not the case the Unit Convenor should consider the request and consult with the appropriate Director of Studies.

8.2 Agreed late coursework should normally be submitted before the remaining coursework is returned to the main student body.

8.3 Coursework submitted after the deadline without prior approval will normally receive a maximum mark of 40% or the relevant pass mark.

8.4 Coursework that is handed in after five working days, without prior approval, will normally receive a mark of zero.

9. Word counts and penalties for exceeding the word count

9.1 Written coursework tasks should normally have a word limit or a word range, and require students to declare a word count with their submitted work.

9.2 Where a word limit or word range applies then the penalty for non-compliance with the word limit or word range should be clearly stated in writing when the assignment task is distributed.

9.3 Where a policy on penalising non-compliance with word limits and word ranges is not stated in accordance with 9.2 then the following default policy will apply:
- the marker(s) will stop reading the work once the student has exceeded a word limit (or the upper figure of a word range) by 10%. If a student writes less than the word limit (or the lower figure of a word range) they risk not maximising their potential mark;
- for the purpose of calculating the word count, footnotes are included, whereas contents pages, executive summaries, tables, figures, appendices and reference lists/bibliographies are excluded.

9.4 Word count penalty policies should be consistently applied as stated.

10. Marking and Grading

10.1 Marking: Each assessment should be marked against the assessment-specific marking criteria, any model answers/marketing scheme, and any relevant generic or specific grade descriptors. As set out in QA9 'Development of all staff and students undertaking teaching activities', students will not normally undertake the marking of summative assessments that contribute to the final award.

10.2 Anonymity: All written examinations should be undertaken and marked on an anonymous basis. Other forms of summative assessment should be marked on an anonymous basis, where practical. Where it is not practical for assignments to be marked anonymously Directors of Studies are encouraged to find alternative mechanisms to guard against perceptions of bias and ensure that marking is fair. The Head of Department shall determine at which point anonymity should cease, whether at the Board of Examiners for Units or for Programmes, or at the Board of Studies.
10.3 **Orals/presentations:** Orals/ presentations which make a significant contribution\(^5\) to the final classification should be recorded as appropriate, and such assessments are subject to the same principles of internal and external moderation as written assessments.

10.4 **Checking of marking**
- Unit Convenors are responsible for ensuring that all pieces of assessment which are not returned to students and/or which contribute to a final classification are checked to ensure that all the output of the candidate has been assessed i.e. no answers have been overlooked by the markers, and the scores have been correctly aggregated.

10.5 **Double marking**
- All final projects/dissertations that make a significant contribution to the final classification, should be blind double marked.
- Each marker should make a record of all mark(s) awarded, together with written comments indicating their rationale for awarding marks.
- Where the marks of a first and second marker differ then, in the first instance, the markers should meet to determine whether, through further discussion, they can agree a final mark.
- Where a first and second marker cannot agree on the mark awarded, the following approach shall apply unless the Head of Department directs otherwise:
  - In instances where the difference is 4% or less, and does not cross a classification boundary, then the average of the marks shall be taken forward to the examination board.
  - In instances where a first and second marker cannot agree, and the difference is more than 4% and/or crosses a classification boundary, a third marker will be appointed by the relevant Head of Department on the basis of their subject expertise. The third marker will receive the marks and comments from the first two markers and discuss the work with them. If the third marker is unable to facilitate the determination of an agreed mark, then the third marker will award a mark anywhere within the range bounded by the marks awarded by the first and second marker, and this mark shall be the mark taken forward to the examination board.
- Once a mark has been determined all records of the original marks and comments of the first and second marker, and how the final agreed mark was determined, should be provided to and retained by the Unit Convenor.

10.6 **Internal moderation**
- All pieces of assessment that contribute to a final award, and which are not double marked, should be subject to a process of internal moderation, the purpose of the moderation being to ensure that the marking is of an appropriate and consistent standard;
- Unless a Head of Department directs otherwise, internal moderation will take the form of sampling, whereby each piece of assessment shall form part of a population from which a sample comprising firsts, all fails, borderlines (or equivalents) and a representative sample in-between, will be drawn for review;
- Internal moderator(s), who will be identified by the Head of Department, should, where practicable, have appropriate subject expertise and not be directly involved in the delivery of the unit;

---

\(^5\) The definition of 'significant contribution' is all work contributing 7% or more towards the degree classification.
- Where internal moderation takes place, a record should be kept of the pieces of work which have been looked at for the purposes of moderation, and by whom. In the case of examination scripts and other retained written work, this may be achieved, typically by the moderator putting an appropriate marking on each relevant script. In other cases, the record should be made and retained by the Unit Convenor;

- Where sample work is sent to an external examiner, the sample should normally comprise the sample or part thereof which has been internally moderated, with the internal moderation duly evidenced;

- Where an issue arises from internal moderation which cannot be resolved through discussion between the initial marker(s) and the internal moderator(s), then the matter should be referred to the Head of Department, who shall provide further directions.

10.7 Providing a written commentary on initial marking

- Initial examiners should, as far as is reasonably practicable, provide written commentary on their marking to assist internal moderators and external examiners in understanding the rationale for marks awarded.

- In the case of work where students are provided with individual feedback e.g. most coursework, the feedback which is provided to the student should normally meet the expectations of section 11 below. In the case of other assessments, notably examination scripts, it may not be practicable to require an initial marker to provide a written commentary in terms appropriate for a student to receive, on every piece of work marked. However, consideration should normally be given to providing some written commentary on pieces of work which are selected for moderation, to assist the moderator (whether internal or external examiner) to understand the initial examiner’s approach.

- The written commentary should normally relate directly to the assessment criteria or model answers.

FEEDBACK

11. Feedback on summative assessments

11.1 Departmental Policies

a) All Departments/the School, the LPO and its partner organisations (where relevant) are required to develop and maintain explicit policies for feedback on assessed work, in particular for examinations, and should include the points listed in 11.2 a-e below. Departments/the School and the LPO are advised to take account of the breadth of units in their programmes, in particular where they include units from other Departments or programmes, in order to ensure appropriateness for learning;

b) Departmental policies on assessment feedback should be based on a pedagogical rationale that is relevant to the discipline concerned, and should contain a level of detail deemed adequate for approval by Faculty/School/ Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees (on the recommendation of Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees where appropriate), having been informed by Student/Staff Liaison Committees, and with a view to converging to faculty-wide policies over time;

c) Feedback policies should be included in programme handbooks. Specific guidance should be given to CPD students who may take units separately and therefore not have access to programme level information;
d) Feedback policies should be reviewed annually. In the case of Departments the annual review should be undertaken by Departmental Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees, having been informed by Staff/Student Liaison Committees, and proposed changes should be submitted for approval by the relevant Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. In the case of the School, the review should be undertaken, and any changes approved, by the School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, having been informed by Staff/Student Liaison Committees. In the case of the LPO any changes should be approved by PAPAC.

11.2 Individual Feedback on Summative Assignments

a) Students should receive prompt feedback on their academic performance in individual summative assignments. This is normally defined as feedback within a maximum of three semester weeks following the submission deadline for the assignment. Where this aspiration cannot be met, the relevant students should be advised by the unit convenor following consultation with the relevant Directors(s) of Studies, and provided with a revised return date. Where a student has failed to meet the submission deadline, the timescale for the provision of feedback is then at the discretion of the Director of Studies;

b) Feedback should ensure that the student understands how best to improve his or her performance in future assessments as well as commending them for achievement. The method of feedback should be consistent with the nature of the assignment, relate to the intended learning outcomes, assessment criteria and any grading descriptors. In some cases, it may be appropriate for students to receive feedback from their Personal Tutor rather than the tutor, postgraduate or teacher who set the original assignment. The Director of Studies is responsible for ensuring that there are appropriate feedback mechanisms in place as part of the overall assessment strategy for the programme of study and that these are clearly communicated to students;

c) Feedback on an individual assignment should relate to the relevant assessment criteria but should also offer constructive comment on a student’s demonstration of generic skills, such as presentational skills and communication skills. In order to provide consistent standards of feedback, it is good practice to use a pro forma feedback sheet that can be attached to the student’s assignment. This overarching feedback can be enhanced by annotations on the actual script/assignment;

d) Continuing students should receive feedback on their academic performance in formal written examinations, but this need not necessarily be individual feedback. At the discretion of the Head of Department and in alignment with departmental policies on feedback, students may be given access to their examination scripts e.g. in cases of substantial concern about individual performance, a tutor may give detailed feedback to the individual student which may include reviewing the examination script;

e) Students are provided with feedback on their level of achievement in each of the units studied during an academic year, by viewing their approved unit results in SAMIS on the web. This feedback may take the form of grades or percentages. Students are also entitled to be informed of their level of achievement in any supplementary assessment. Students are also provided with periodic feedback on their overall academic performance in the form of credit-weighted averages displayed on SAMIS on the web;

f) To this end Directors of Administration and Heads of Department are responsible for identifying appropriate resources for:

- ensuring that unit marks for Semester 1 summative assessments have been processed on SAMIS and approved at the relevant Board of Examiners within five
weeks of the end of the examination period in order to allow students to view their results on SAMIS on the web;
• ensuring that unit marks for Semester 2 summative assessments have been processed on SAMIS and approved at the relevant Board of Examiners before the end of the sixth week of the summer vacation in order to allow continuing students to view their results on SAMIS on the web following the Board of Studies committee approving the progression decision;
• ensuring that unit marks for Semester 2 summative assessments have been agreed on SAMIS and approved at the relevant Board of Examiners in order to allow graduating undergraduate students to view their results on SAMIS on the web following the Board of Studies committee approving the award.

g) The provision of feedback via SAMIS on the web should be accompanied by an opportunity to discuss performance with the Personal Tutor or other appropriate members of staff as identified by the Head of Department. This opportunity should be clearly communicated to all relevant students;

h) Directors of Studies are responsible for ensuring that students receive appropriate academic counselling to support their decisions at key points during their studies, for example, unit selection, transfer of programme, change of mode of study, progression to an undergraduate Masters programme etc. This counselling may be provided by the Personal Tutor, Academic Tutor, Year Tutor or Director of Studies according to the Department/School or partner organisation (where appropriate);

i) Directors of Studies are responsible for ensuring that there are sufficient mechanisms in place to identify students whose academic performance is giving cause for concern. These students should be offered prompt academic counselling and frequent feedback on their performance.

11.3 Transcripts

a) Transcripts are paper documents which record in detail the academic attainment of each student throughout their period of study for each award. Transcripts will include original marks and the outcomes of any supplementary assessment (see QA35: Assessment Procedures, paragraphs 6.12 and 6.13, or, for programmes and students taking supplementary assessment under the New Framework for Assessment: Assessment Regulations, Appendix 7 of the NFAAR-UG or NFAAR-PGT, as appropriate.

b) There are two forms of transcript:
• a full transcript showing all detail of a student’s assessment;
• an exit summary transcript of unit results provided as a ‘public’ document.

c) Academic Registry will provide all graduating students with a hard copy of their exit summary transcript and their full transcript. These will contain details of a student’s academic performance which will include original marks and the outcome of any supplementary assessment. Guidance on the production of both full and exit summary transcripts is available.

12. Boards of Examiners

Arrangements for the conduct of Boards of Examiners for Units and Programmes are described in the appropriate (UG, PG etc.) New Framework for Assessment document under Assessment Decision-making and in QA35: Assessment Procedures for Programmes not compliant with NFAAR.
13. Monitoring and evaluation of assessment and feedback practice

13.1 The monitoring and evaluation of assessment practice arises in a range of ways, including:

- the annual review of Department/School/LPO feedback policies (see 11.1d) above);
- the process for the annual monitoring of units and programmes (see QA51);
- the process of Degree Scheme Review (see QA13).

13.2 The evaluation of assessment practice may encompass as appropriate:

- considering the extent to which assessment is effective in measuring student achievement of programme/unit learning outcomes;
- checking that assessment is responsive to external developments, including professional, regulatory or statutory bodies requirements, where appropriate;
- monitoring and comparing student achievement and academic standards over time;
- analysing trends in results, for example, to analyse mark, grade or honours distributions, or to identify any relation between student entry qualifications and assessment outcomes.

---
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