

ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

Last updated: September 2018

Assessment and feedback framework

This assessment and feedback framework should be used in the design and development of all new undergraduate programmes, including with collaborative partners, as well as in the review and revalidation of existing programmes. The aims of the framework are:

- To underpin consistency and fairness across the Roehampton academic offer (wherever and however the programme is delivered)
- To ensure clarity and transparency for students and staff in all aspects of assessment, including the setting of assessments, the marking and moderation process and the delivery of feedback
- To drive improvements in the quality of teaching, in particular, around assessment and feedback
- To promote 'assessment for learning' and high levels of student engagement
- To reduce assessment loads, where applicable, and avoid unnecessary duplication of assessment-related activities
- To support all students on campus and at collaborative partners to achieve to the best of their abilities

In establishing a set of assessment equivalences (see appendix), the framework seeks to promote a wide range of approaches to assessment essential for inclusive practice.¹ It is expected that programmes will use an appropriate range of assessment activities to demonstrate achievement across programme learning outcomes mapped against Roehampton's graduate attributes.

Programmes teams will be responsible for designing and overseeing assessment methods. Any variations from the framework will be subject to the approval of the Learning Teaching and Quality Committee. On programmes subject to external professional accreditation, the assessment requirements of the external body will take precedence over the assessment equivalences set out in this framework subject to the approval of Curriculum Strategy Committee.

All changes to assessment will be overseen by department or school learning, teaching and quality groups (LTQGs).

¹ The framework for inclusive learning and teaching practice sets out further details of how approaches to assessment should support inclusive practice.

Requirements

Assessment Design

1. In curriculum design, the primary focus should be the assessment of programme learning outcomes. Module learning outcomes must be mapped to these programme learning outcomes to ensure that all the programme learning outcomes are assessed during the course of the programme.
2. Assessment design should also consider how programme learning outcomes cut across individual modules and assessments planned accordingly to minimise the duplication of assessment of programme learning outcomes. In this way, while programme level assessments are not possible under the university's academic regulations, a programme-level approach to assessment design can be taken even if individual assessments remain at module level.
3. For a standard 20-credit module, there should be a maximum of two summative assessment components. These may be broken down into a series of smaller sub-component parts, for example, in a portfolio assessment form.
4. Guidelines for assessment loads for summative assessments are set out in the table below. These provide a benchmark for assessments across all programmes and should be read in conjunction with the assessment equivalences set out in the appendix. As standard practice, where there is more than one summative assessment, students are only required to achieve a pass mark overall.
5. Formative assessment activities are an essential element of good practice in assessment for learning. Programme teams are expected to embed formative assessments in all modules. All students should have had the opportunity to complete a formative piece of assessment that is directly linked to the summative assessment by week 5 or as soon as possible after that in each semester.
6. Formative assessments should not as standard practice carry a summative mark for the module. Where such assessment includes a summative element, this should not exceed 20 per cent of the final summative mark for the module; and should not, as standard practice, be a required element to pass a module.
7. Assessment strategies should be designed for inclusivity, but arrangements must also be in place to allow for reasonable adjustments where necessary in order to enable disabled students to demonstrate the achievement of the learning outcomes
8. Programmes should build in opportunities for student self- and peer assessment and for dialogue with academics and peers about their work. This helps students to learn more about themselves as learners and about the way their performance is assessed.
9. The requirements of collaborative partners must be considered when designing programme assessment strategies. This is particularly important where different and/or additional assessment periods are used which will require the production of multiple assessment briefs. In such cases with collaborative partners, assessments should be set and agreed on a rolling 12-month basis.
10. The use of authentic assessment should be considered. This is defined by the QAA as 'assessment methods that are more reflective of the ways in which students will actually use the knowledge they learn (practical exams or face-to-face assessments). The use of vivas in particular should be considered.

Implementation

11. Programmes should share assessments and their criteria with students early in the semester to ensure that wording is clear & unambiguous and expectations understood. This should take place face-to-face in class and as a podcast on Moodle.
12. Student should have the opportunity to engage in a range of summative assessments. If an unfamiliar types of assessment is being used, students must have the opportunity to rehearse and discuss this in the first half of the semester.
13. It is expected that the response time taken to provide feedback on formative assessments will be shorter and that a variety of approaches to feedback (including immediate feedback from online tests, verbal feedback, group feedback to whole classes and peer-to-peer) will be adopted.
14. Feedback on assessments must be timely, clear and constructive. It should clearly explain why a mark was given against the criteria given in advance; and should help the student improve their future performance. Feedback should encourage self-reflection and be motivational.
15. Feedback on summative assessments (including the provisional release of marks) should be given within a maximum of 20 working days and where possible within 15 working days.² On semester 1 modules, feedback must be released to students by the end of week 15 (i.e. the last week of semester 1).

Quality and Standards

16. Wherever practicable, assessments should be submitted and marked and feedback given online. Programmes should provide the opportunity for students to use originality checking software and, where possible, to submit assessment online.
17. Wherever it is practicable, assessment will be conducted without any student's name or personal identity being revealed to the marker(s). All examination scripts are marked anonymously. Further details of marking and moderation requirements can be found in Assessment Procedures available from the Academic Office.
18. The marking and moderation process should be clearly communicated to students.
19. Preparing students for assessment tasks is a critical part of student induction at all levels and across all modules. As part of student induction each semester, clear information on assessment must be provided to students via module and programme Moodle sites. This should include the type, timing and weighting of assessments on each module; the assessment criteria that will be applied; and what is expected from students on any particular piece of assessments. Where feasible, model answers and/or examples of successful and unsuccessful summative assessments should be available for students on Moodle. Students should be given the opportunity to discuss anonymised pieces of assessment in their First Year to develop an awareness and appreciation of standards

² A 15-working day marking period is common practice across a lot of the sector. Programme teams are encouraged to consider feedback times as part of their review of learning, teaching and assessment plans, in particular, to address issues of over-assessment, the duplication of assessment tasks and the balance and weighting of formative and summative assessment activities.

20. Led by the programme convenor, programme teams should work to ensure that all staff teaching on a programme, including visiting lecturers and post-graduate research students, share a common understanding of the purpose of assessment tasks set and the associated marking criteria. Clear information should also be shared with collaborative partners (so as to ensure consistency between sites) and should include indicative answers.

Table 1: Guidelines for summative assessment loads per 20 credit module

| | Year 1 (HE4) | Year 2 (HE5) | Year 3 (HE6) |
|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Coursework only | 2500 words | 3000 words | 4000 words |
| Exam only | 1.5 hours | 2 hours | 3 hours |
| C/W and exam | 1500 + 1 hour | 2500 + 1.5 hours | 3000 + 2 hours |
| Dissertation (40 credits) | NA | NA | 10000 words |

- The table sets out guideline benchmarks for summative assessment loads on a 20-credit module. Lesser assessment loads should be considered. Assessment equivalences for other assessment types are set out in the appendix below. The assessment loads reflect the growing complexity and demands of a programme; and the building of independent learning skills that for many students will culminate in a substantial 40 credit dissertation in year 3.
- To avoid over-assessment, programmes should limit assessment to the minimum required to test student achievement against programme learning outcomes.
- Where word lengths are an inherent part of the learning outcomes of a programme or module (e.g. the ability to write a piece of creative writing of a certain length), then these assessment loads may be exceeded. The rationale for any such variation must be set out in the learning, teaching and assessment strategy in the programme validation documentation and agreed as part of the validation process.
- Where formative assessment includes a summative dimension, this summative element should be subtracted from the maximum assessment loads set out in the table.
- Portfolio assessments should not exceed the maximum load in total.

Appendix

| Assessment Equivalencies Framework Based on 20-Credit Modules at Undergraduate Level – SUMMATIVE only | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Assessment group | Assessment examples (indicative) | Weighting | Level | | |
| | | | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Written | Essay Literature Review Report Creative Writing Research proposal Portfolio Lab report Case Study Reflective journal Field Work Report | 100% 50% 25% | 2500 words 1500 words 1000 words | 3000 words 2000 words 1000 words | 4000 words 2500 words 1500 words Dissertation lengths should be pro-rated accordingly e.g. a 40-credit Dissertation contributing 100 % to the overall module mark should normally be no more than 10000 words |
| Practical | Micro Teaching Student-led session Lab task Dance Drama production Blog Wiki/website Film Performance Exhibition | | No set tariff is proposed for practical assessments because of the discipline-specific nature of these tasks. Colleagues are asked, however, to consider both the time required to prepare for and complete the task to ensure equity with other assessment in the programme. This mode of assessment should not be more onerous than a piece of written work. | | |
| Presentation | Oral Poster Group Virtual | 100% 50% 25% | 10 mins 7 mins 5 mins | 15 mins 10 mins 7 mins | 15 mins 10 mins 7 mins |
| Examination | Disclosed Open Book Closed Book | 100% 50% 25% | 1.5 hours 1.5 hours 1 hour | 2 hours 1.5 hours 1 hour | 3 hours 2 hours 1.5 hours |
| | Oral Practical Class Test | | Colleagues are asked to consider using heavily weighted examinations sparingly. Please take into account that students with additional needs may be eligible for extra time (usually 25% but occasionally 50%) | | |