



Assessment Committees Review

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

RACHEL MORRITT, ASSISTANT HEAD OF
PROGRAMMES & ASSESSMENT

Structure at Leeds

- Schools operate Assessment Committees locally according to institutional terms of reference
- Two tier structure
- Assessment Board = reviews overall module results
- Progression & Awards Boards = considers individual student profiles to determine outcome

Review of Assessment Committee operations

- Anecdotal reports suggested Committees may not be operating effectively and/or in accordance with terms of reference.
- Suggestions that we had wider issues with their operations.
- Review launched in 2023/24
- Every Board was observed by a member of the professional services Assessment Management Team.
- 39 Assessment Boards, 58 Progression & Awards Boards

Approach to the observations

- The review had senior level support and was communicated in advance
- The observations were coordinated centrally and chairs were informed
- Pre-defined questions were used and answered using a Microsoft Form
- Agreement that there would be no intervention if irregularities were spotted
- Outcomes of the observations were collated and presented as a whole, rather than implicating individual areas

Outcome of the observations

- The anonymised outcomes were presented to the appropriate committee along with recommendations for consideration
- The summary of the outcomes demonstrated that, on the whole, Assessment Boards did operate within the terms of reference and did follow current operational processes
- Some areas were, however, outliers
- Individual areas were able to see the presented observations and bench-mark their operations against others.
- Faculty Pro-Deans for Student Education were encouraged to support outliers to fall into line or to explore the reasons why they didn't already

Key recommendations

The presented observations led to the following key recommendations, of which the highlighted ones were adopted:

- 1. Require mandatory use of template agendas and the sharing of relevant documentation ahead of the Committee.
- 2. For Assessment Boards, require Module Leaders to
 - a. confirm the accuracy of marks, and
 - b. provide written reports on the module assessments ahead of the Assessment Board.
- 3. Assuming recommendation 2 is adopted, remove the requirement for Module Leaders to attend the Assessment Board (this would require a change to the Assessment Board Terms of Reference).
- 4. Require the holding of pre-Awards Boards to be mandatory, or strongly recommended, but these should not have the same membership as the main Awards Board minus the External Examiner.
- 5. Removal of the degree classification trends from the Awards Board to another forum (e.g. Faculty Standards and Assessment Group, or school equivalent) (this would require a change to the Progression & Awards Board Terms of Reference), or seek to (re-)embed this within the Boards.
- 6. Development and delivery of training for Chairs of Assessment Committees, to be delivered annually as a minimum and at which attendance for new Chairs would be mandatory.

Outcomes....

- Clarified expectations and introduced more clearly defined standards and standardisation
- Prevented local 'creep' of terms of reference and operations
- Provided institutional oversight and the case for future change and conversations around the efficacy of Assessment Committees
- Annual training/briefing for chairs (new and old) now established (now in third year) and provides useful updates and a forum for discussion. Delivered by Associate Pro-Vice Chancellor alongside appropriate professional services colleagues.

Any further information....

- Please feel free to get in touch....
- Rachel Morritt, Assistant Head of Programmes & Assessment
- R.morritt@leeds.ac.uk