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The next meeting of the Teaching & Learning Committee will be held in the Faculty Meeting Room 158 on Tuesday 10 March 2009 at 2pm. All members are expected to attend or ensure that a representative from the School will attend on their behalf.

1. MINUTES
   Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting of the Teaching and Learning Committee held on Monday 3 November 2008.

2. DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICT OR PERCEIVED CONFLICT OF INTEREST
   The Chair invites members to declare interest in relation to any item on the agenda.
3. **ITEMS/BUSINESS IN PROGRESS FOR NOTING SINCE PREVIOUS MEETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/Business in Progress</th>
<th>Progress Update</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Guide for Faculty Staff.</td>
<td>Draft to be checked by Faculty Student Advisor and Faculty Manager prepared by Ms Heather Morton</td>
<td>On hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal request to SIMS for standardised marks. Request has been submitted for the position in cohort (percentage) which is easier to calculate.</td>
<td>Chair and Faculty Manager to report</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The specification of learning outcomes for courses and majors offered in the Faculty.</td>
<td>Audit to be undertaken by CATLyst. School to recommend major/s sequence</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of each major sequence to determine whether English Language Competency Skills are shown in at least one unit in each year level.</td>
<td>Audit to be undertaken by CATLyst. School to recommend major/s sequence</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Operational Priorities Plan (OPP) implementation strategies and targets</td>
<td>Faculty Manager has updated implementation strategies and targets and distributed them to members for consideration</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should students at PSB be offered a 1) BSc Science and Technology or 2) BSc with selected majors</td>
<td>Academic Student Advisor to report</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New grade for failed component (FC)</td>
<td>Academic Student Advisor</td>
<td>To be discussed at March meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I – Items for Communication to be dealt with en bloc**

The University has participated in an Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) project *The WIL Report: A National Scoping Study.*

Over the last 18 months, ACEN as the lead organisation for this project, hosted by Griffith University, Queensland University of Technology and Swinburne University of Technology, undertook the first large scale scoping study of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) curriculum in contemporary Australian higher education. The project, identified, examined and mapped key issues and challenges related to work integrated learning and developed recommendations for a way forward. The report encapsulates the outcomes of the project including the consultative process; the key issues and challenges identified to date, and the framework for future projects.

The report can be accessed from either of the following websites:


Part II – Items for Decision to be dealt with en bloc

The Faculty Offshore Programs Director raised a question with the Academic Student Advisor of how the Faculty handles the outcome of supplementary exams. He asked does the Faculty:

1. Replace the original exam mark with the supplementary exam mark and then add all other unit marks (mid semester test, lab marks) to it and if the sum is \( \geq 50\% \) the student has passed, or
2. Take the supplementary exam mark alone and the student only passes the unit if he/she achieved \( \geq 50\% \).

The Academic Student Advisor confirmed that a supplementary exam replaces all previous assessment in the unit. It is intended as an opportunity for the student to show that, despite having failed the unit, he/she does know the work well enough to be allowed to progress (for supps at level 1) or to be given the final credit points that complete the degree (in the case of the 'final supp'). Furthermore, the 'final supp' is available only for a unit in which the student is enrolled in his/her 'final' semester, not a previous semester. The new rule has applied in Science since, and including, 2008. However, there is a slight exception to this rule for PSB only.

Part III – Items for Discussion and Decision

4. CHAIR’S REPORT

The Chair will report on Teaching and Learning issues of interest to members including the Anonymous Assessment report (Attachment A). By way of background, in early 2007, the Assessment Standing Committee of the Teaching and Learning Committee commissioned a small working party, convened by Professor Graeme Martin, to explore possible models of anonymous assessment which was anticipated to be implemented in UWA end of semester examinations. This deliberation was prompted by ongoing interest in anonymous assessment from both the Student Guild and other members of the University community over the past few years. The Assessment Standing Committee have requested feedback (Attachment B) for this report; specifically seeking the Committees views concerning possible university-wide implementation of the proposed system of ‘anonymous’ assessment. Feedback via email is sought by Tuesday, 31 March 2009.

5. NEW GRADE FOR FAILED COMPONENT

At the September meeting a member requested clarification of the introduction of a new grade ‘FC’ which indicated that although the student had achieved a score greater than or equal to 50% a compulsory component of the unit had been failed. Members had previously agreed that a small group should be set up lead by the Academic Student Advisor to discuss this issue. However, no members had been able to volunteer to be in this group. The Academic Student has since attended a meeting held by the Academic Secretary in February relating to this issue. It has been decided that the ‘FC’ grade is to be available in all units, i.e. no need for specific approval beforehand (as is required for UP/UF units); and if it is to be used in a unit, the ‘assessment mechanism statement’ must spell out clearly what it is and the circumstances in which it will be applied. The Academic Student Advisor feels that the relation between the grade ‘FC’ and the supplementary exam is still problematic and would like to discuss the following:

- As FC is awarded to students whose raw mark would be over 50%, and as it is to be calculated in the WAM as 48%, it is fair to view these students as potentially eligible for a supplementary exam if available in the unit (level 1, or 'final supp'). The failed component may, however, not be suitable for supplementary assessment, in fact generally won't be, if we are thinking of it primarily as applying to the lab component. That's acceptable (if made clear to students), but could be fiddly;
• what happens if a student fails the lab component and gets 47% overall? -- He/she will get a supp exam.

Furthermore, the Academic Student Advisor feels that it would be useful to have a standard wording, or model wording, for units in which FC is going to be used.

On a related issue the Academic Student Advisor feels that another useful standard statement for unit outlines would be something to the effect that materials on line are provided as an additional service (supplementary to the scheduled classes) to help students, but their availability cannot be guaranteed, and lack of availability will not be grounds for special consideration.

6. UNIT INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (UIMS)
A review of the management of unit information and unit outlines undertaken by the Faculty of Life and Physical Sciences (LPS) in July 2008, determined that unit information was best managed using a database system where staff are able to enter information directly onto a web based template. In the review, LPS staff indicated that they wanted a unit information system that was easy to use, automated, derived as much information as possible from other sources and did not require double entry of data.

In collaboration, LPS and The Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (NAS) have built upon the Calliope System to develop a more robust, simplified and functional system. This new system, UIMS, focuses on the needs of the students and staff at the faculty and school level. The development phase is currently under way and UIMS is available online from the link below:

http://www.unitoutlines.uwa.edu.au/

In February the Program Manager Matthew Kohler demonstrated the new system. The briefing notes which include the implementation timetable are attached (Attachment C).

This item was discussed at the Faculty Executive Committee meeting in February where it was agreed that from Semester one 2009 unit outlines were required to be updated using UIMS.

7. FORMALISING A POLICY FOR PERMITTING A SECOND OVERLOAD
The Academic Student Advisor would like to discuss the possibility of formalising a policy for permitting a second overload which could be displayed on the Faculty website. Students are currently advised that an overload in 2nd semester will be approved, after an overload (over 27 points in 1st semester); if in 1st semester they have passed all units, with at least 55% in each and an average of at least 60%. This is designed to protect students, and as in most policies there should be a "normally" in there to allow exceptions in particular circumstances. It has been suggested that the policy should also state that taking an overload is always on the student's own responsibility and is never grounds, in its self, for special consideration.

8. MASTER OF SCIENCE THESIS – FACULTY POSITIONAL STATEMENT ON COMPLETION BY PAPERS
The representative from the School of Sport Science, Exercise and Health has provided information from the Graduate Research & Scholarships Office 2009 (Attachment D) relating to Postgraduate Research completed as a paper or series of papers which he would like to discuss at the March meeting.

9. SCHOOL REPORTS
Representatives will report on Teaching and Learning activities in their Schools.
10. CATLYST REPORT
CATLyst will report on current Teaching and Learning issues.

11. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE REPORT
Postgraduate and Undergraduate representatives will report on any issue or concerns from the student body.

12. OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS
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1 Background

In early 2007 the University’s Assessment Standing Committee commissioned a small working party, convened by Professor Graeme Martin, to consider the issue of anonymous assessment in examinations. This deliberation was prompted by ongoing interest in anonymous assessment from both the Student Guild and other members of the university community over the past few years. The concept is not new: the Law School has anonymous examination protocols in place, and it is common practice in some universities. Anonymity in examination assessment was last considered at UWA in the 1990s, so revisiting the issue in light of a decade’s further research and practice is timely.

As one outcome of this deliberation, the Assessment Standing Committee agreed to sponsor a trial of anonymous assessment in examinations in a small sample of units, scheduled to take place in selected end of semester examinations in the first semester of 2008.

Student Services staff prepared a detailed plan for a pilot of anonymous assessment and this plan was ratified by the Assessment Standing Committee at its meeting on 22 November 2007 for implementation in Semester 1 2008.
2 Process

The process followed for this pilot project was as follows:

- A report titled “Examination Script Anonymity - Business Impact Statement and Project Plan V1.0” was presented to the Assessment Standing Committee at its meeting of 22 November 2007.
- The committee endorsed the plan and approved its implementation
- A range of units was selected to cover all faculties and a variety of types of examination (see Appendix B Units Used in the Pilot)
- Meetings were arranged with faculties to discuss the units chosen within their faculty:
  - Law – Tue 27 Nov 2007
  - EMC – Thu 29 Nov 2007
  - AHSS – Thu 29 Nov 2007
  - LPS – Mon 10 Dec 2007
  - Business School – Thu 13 Dec 2007
  - ALVA – Tue 18 Dec 2007
  - MDHS – Mon 18 Feb 2008
  - NAS – Wed 20 Feb 2008
  - Education – none (Education has no written semester examinations)
- A web page was set up with the key information (see http://www.studentadmin.uwa.edu.au/welcome/anonymous_assessment_pilot_project__semester_1_2008
- Students were sent a letter (see Appendix C Letter to Students) on Tue 3 Jun 2008 outlining the units which they were taking and the procedures to be followed for the anonymous assessment.
- A number of meetings were arranged with the Business School IT Service to discuss changes to the MCQ sheets (Multi-choice answer sheets)
- A briefing session was held for all staff involved in the units on Wed 11 June 2008
- Staff were emailed with a link to the web page (see Appendix D Email to Staff Advising of Student Letter)
- Invigilators were instructed on the first morning of the examinations of the changed procedures
- The examinations were conducted from 14 to 28 June 2008. 3,956 student participated across 38 units in the pilot, with each student having one or more anonymous units as well as their normally assessed units as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Number of Anonymous Assessment Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3551</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Students were invited to fill in a survey (see http://www.simssupport.uwa.edu.au/surveys/survey_2008/Anon_Student_Survey). A survey information slip was handed out at all anonymous examination sessions and students were also sent a reminder email on 26 June 2008
- Academic staff were invited on 2 July 2008 to complete a survey (see http://www.simssupport.uwa.edu.au/surveys/survey_2008/Anon_AcStaff_Survey)
- Professional staff were invited on 14 July to complete the survey (see http://www.simssupport.uwa.edu.au/surveys/survey_2008/Anon_PrStaff_Survey)
- Invigilators were invited on 28 June to complete the survey (see Appendix E Survey of Supervisors)
3 Survey Response Statistics

3.1 Students

1,171 students completed the survey out of a possible 3,956 (29.6%). The breakdown of respondents based on their declared unit information was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHSS</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALVA</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1171</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Academic Staff

24 academic staff completed the survey out of a possible 38 (63%).

3.3 Professional Staff

The Professional staff survey was offered to all professional staff involved in the Pilot, including Schools, Faculties, Student Administration and SIMS Support. Responses were received from 22 staff, out of a possible 60 (36.6%). The breakdown of respondents by role was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Student Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School administrative staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMS Support</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Administration Enquiry Counter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Administration Examinations Office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Declared</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Invigilators

17 Invigilators completed the survey out of a possible 19 (89%).
4 Communication

Communication to stakeholders was outlined in the original plan. The aim was to strike a balance between communicating too early and risking that the details would be forgotten, but early enough so that stakeholders were well prepared. Feedback from students strongly advised that more communication should have been done, particularly with a number of reminders to students via email in the lead up and immediately prior to each anonymous examination.

4.1 Student Survey Results

Students were generally satisfied that sufficient communication had occurred and that it was of a reasonable quality.

![Bar graph showing student survey results for Q2A: I was kept well informed of the Anonymous Assessment pilot.](image-url)
4.1.1 Student Open-ended Comments

4.1.1.1 Mode and Effectiveness of communication

35 students mentioned that the information in the letter was clear and helpful. Some students said that they preferred to receive a letter because they do not check their email regularly. Some students suggested that having their seat number specified in the letter would have been helpful.

26 students said that the letter was not clear. Some misconceptions and/or lack of clarity arising from the letter included:

- that the letter implied that students should not be writing their names on the examination attendance slip
- that all of the units listed in the letter were being examined anonymously
- the use of the words “trial” and “pilot” interchangeably was confusing
- unsure of where to find the seat number, or indeed what it was
- inadequate explanation of what was required of the student
- too much information causing stress and making the process sound complicated
- instruction to print out the timetable was unnecessary and caused stress if the student had printing problems
- the way in which the papers were to be marked was not explained
- eight students were worried that they had been singled out for the anonymous assessment pilot, and that not all students in the unit were involved.

One student suggested that the Pilot should have been publicised more, perhaps making it general information known to all students rather than just those sitting the relevant exams.

48 students commented that they would have preferred an email to be sent in addition to or instead of the letter. Students generally do not seem to place a high priority on written correspondence. Some students also suggested additional notification in studentConnect, WebCT etc. Reasons for not receiving the letter included:

- mailing address in SIMS out of date
• mailing address is their home address and they do not live there
• mailing usually is HECS account

One student was most indignant at the cost of mailing letters to 4,000 students and also the environmental cost of asking students to print out their timetable showing seat number.

Eight students reported that they arrived at the examination venue unaware that they should sit in an allocated seat and this surprised and concerned them. Observation by staff attending the examination venues indicates that a much higher proportion of students were unaware of the allocated seating.

4.1.1.2 Timeliness and Reminders

Ten students felt that they were informed officially (by letter) too late in the process and that the allocation of seats should have occurred earlier so that it appeared in the letter and on their timetable when they first printed it out. The proximity of the notice to the start of examinations caused some of them stress.

13 students suggested that a reminder email, including the unit, venue, date and time and seat number, just before the exams would have been helpful as they had forgotten the details contained in the letter by that stage.

One student suggested that it would have been better if the seating plan for the venues had been posted online before the examinations.

Two students reported in the survey that they were annoyed that they had not been advised about the survey.

4.1.1.3 Reasons for the Pilot

30 students said that they were not clear as to the reason for conducting the Pilot and in fact what anonymity meant and what the benefits were. Two students were quite annoyed that Law units were included in the Pilot.

4.1.1.4 Explanation of Pilot from Lecturers

Seven students remarked that they did not receive any notification via their lecturers, and they felt that an explanation of why the pilot was being conducted would have helped. Two students did indicate that lecturing staff had clearly explained the pilot to their class. One student suggested that an examination officer should have addressed each affected class before the end of semester.

4.2 Academic Staff Survey Results

Academic staff were generally satisfied that sufficient communication had occurred and that it was of a reasonable quality.
Academic staff generally felt that students were aware of the Pilot, but there was recognition that a proportion did not seem to be aware.
4.2.1 Academic Staff Open-ended Comments

Comments from staff included:
- the information was clear
- some staff had difficulty getting from QEII to find the meeting room in Geography/Geology
- staff were not advised of what to tell the students, or what information was given to the students.
- information was not passed on from Unit Co-ordinator to examination markers
- the process for combining marks was not presented in a clear way

4.3 Professional Staff Survey results

Professional staff were generally satisfied that sufficient communication had occurred and that it was of a reasonable quality.
Professional staff generally felt that students were aware of the Pilot, but there was recognition that a proportion did not seem to be aware.
4.3.1 Professional Staff Open-ended Comments

Comments from staff included:

- I found out about the pilot quite late for someone who would ultimately be in the position of helping staff to upload results.
- I found the training session extremely frustrating and confusing. I think there should have been 2 sessions- one for admin staff and the second for unit coordinators then the admin staff wouldn’t have to waste a lot of time on some very frivolous questions!
- Most students who queried their letter didn’t read the information, couldn’t pronounce anonymous and didn’t know what the word meant.
- All news to the students involved. Student Administration Counter staff didn’t know anything about it either.
- Communication was okay, except that I somehow was dropped from the email list and was dependant upon my colleagues to keep me informed of the process.

4.4 Invigilator Survey Results

Invigilators were satisfied that sufficient communication had occurred and that it was of a reasonable quality.
4.4.1 Invigilator Open-ended Comments

Comments from invigilators included:
- Venue not declared: All communication was well delivered
• Winthrop Hall: After the initial introduction things ran relatively smoothly
   Several students did not fill their name out on the blue ID slip because
   they said the exam was anonymous and they didn't need to fill it in
• Fox LT The Manager explained it to the Chief Supervisor. I have limited
   experience with the old system.
• ALR5 No problems.
• Undercroft We were well informed.
   Students are sometimes unprepared.
   It would have helped to know at the beginning of the exams which exams
   were to be part of the pilot, as this would save on unnecessary
   preparation by the Chief Supervisor
5 Timetabling

5.1 Professional Staff Survey results

There are only two staff within Student Administration involved in timetabling. Timetabling was far more complex to manage with allocated seating. Late changes to timetables due to alternative arrangements for students with disabilities causes a significant amount of manual effort in re-allocating seating.

![Q3A The timetabling process was no more difficult than normal](image)
Q3B Seat allocation was straightforward

Q3C The amount of extra time saved or spent on timetabling the examination was:

5.1.1 Examinations Office Open-ended Comments

Comments from Examinations Office staff included:
- more time was required to ensure that seat allocation was completed
- difficulties were encountered with student numbers being located in Scheduler
• when students are removed from a venue, their seat cannot be reused in that venue.
• there were approximately 744 exam instances of TBA (students with exam timetable clashes) and Access students who needed their exams in an alternate venue or at an alternate time, and for each of these the Examinations Officer had to find each student’s ID which was a bit more difficult than name identification and took longer to complete the process.
6 Answering Student Queries

6.1 Professional Staff Survey Results

Professional staff who answered student queries reported that there was a mixture of awareness and readiness amongst students who were about to participate in the anonymous assessment Pilot. However, it is likely that the students who presented themselves to staff with queries were the ones who had not read the information sent out earlier.

Q4A Students were reasonably well informed about the anonymous assessment process

![Bar chart showing responses to Q4A question]

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- Not Applicable
Q4B Students were comfortable that the process would not interfere with their examination preparation and readiness

Staff reported a moderate amount of additional time spent dealing with student queries about anonymous assessment.

Q4C The amount of time spent on answering student queries related to anonymous assessment was:

6.1.1 Professional Staff Open-ended Comments

Comments from Professional staff included:
• (School Administrative Staff) Queries regarding this particular exam were very few. We just had our usual inquiries, nothing extra during the relevant time period.

• (Examinations Office) Some students who contacted our office seemed to think they were being singled out and wanted to know why.

• (Student Administration Enquiry Counter) Simpler information, less detail (less to read) makes it more likely students will read what we send. Students need to know there will be a benefit for them. Students generally did not know what anonymous assessment meant or even implied. Students did not read all the information and fronted up to the Enquiry Counter and we advised them, well once we knew what was happening we did.

• (SIMS Support Staff) Many students either were not aware of the fact that they needed a seat number or chose to ignore it.
7 Examination Sessions

7.1 Student Survey Results

Almost one quarter of students who responded to the survey claimed that the anonymous assessment procedure caused additional stress.

Most students felt that signage provided was sufficient for them to find their seat easily.
Most students indicated that moving into the venue and finding their seat was easy.

For those students who were not sure of their seat number, the majority found that the assistance provided by staff was sufficient.
7.1.1 Student Open-ended Comments

7.1.1.1 Allocated Seats

There was quite a division on feeling about allocated seats. 24 students felt that allocated seating was beneficial because:

- it avoids a mad scrabble for (and the stress of finding) seats in some exams.
- It provides peace of mind that a seat is allocated, and if the student arrives slightly later than the others, they don’t have to stress about where the empty seats are
- it is faster and easier than normal when filling out required information
- designated seating stops students planning on sitting together and cheating
- numbered seating (with labels on desks) actually makes it easier to find your seat in venues where multiple exams are running concurrently

67 students did not like being allocated to a seat because of:

- the stress of having to check one’s seat number, arriving early to avoid congestion, remembering one’s seat number etc
- not able to choose seat position near window, at the front, in sight of the clock (bad eyesight), not crowded in on all sides (claustrophobia) etc
- having to sit in a location which is prone to interruptions from other students (near door for example)
- having to sit at a wobbly table
- having to put up with the sun streaming in the window (Winthrop Hall)
- having to remember a different seat number for every examination
- confusion and disruption caused by students arriving late and not knowing their seat number
- concern about sitting in the wrong seat and being mixed up with another student
- the stress of finding someone else sitting in your own seat
- suspicion that allocating seats allows anonymity to be circumvented because University staff know where the student was sitting
lost exam time when errors were made in seating (even if the error was not the students’ fault)
knowing who you’re sitting near in every exam
Many of these students felt that their examination performance had suffered because of the allocated seating.
Three students indicated that they were neutral about the allocation of seats.

7.1.1.2 Seating Confusion

Many students were confused about the allocated seating arrangements (38 students). Comments from students included:
- students did not know which seat they had been allocated
- students who had sat in the wrong seat and having filled in the booklets, taking them with them when asked to move and leaving nothing for the student who was correctly allocated to that seat
- students finding another student sitting in their allocated seat caused stress
- students were moved to the correct seat after the examination had commenced, interrupting other students
- students presented at the wrong room
- insufficient assistance and/or abruptness from invigilators for students who did not know where to sit
- confusing seating plans posted outside the venue
- studentConnect not being available just before the examination, causing stress to students who could not look up their allocated seat number. (Note that server logs did not support this claim, so the issue must have been localised to that student or their location).
- students sitting in alternative arrangements rooms were confused about seating and the invigilators were unaware of the pilot
- units split across multiple venues caused confusion as students did not know which venue they were in
- one student reported that they were unable to log on to studentConnect in the days before the exam, and so could not find out their seat number, and due to the lack of information they had received about the Pilot did not know how much of a problem this was.

7.1.1.3 Seating was easy

30 students reported that the seating arrangements were simple with comments that:
- the invigilators were helpful and patient
- the additional staff outside the doors were helpful in advising them of their seats
- the desks were all labelled with the appropriate numbers
- signage inside and outside the venue was very helpful

7.1.1.4 Seating improvements

32 students suggested some improvements that could be made to the seating arrangements including:
- more than one seating plan notice at the entrance, and not too close to the doorway, showing the seating plan to avoid congestion
- better signage showing seat numbers that are in the row (at the front and back)
- a map of the seating arrangements provided on student connect or via email
- earlier advice of seating allocation
- a list showing student number/seat number at the entrance to the venue
- having the same seat number allocated throughout the exam period
- the ability for students to nominate where they will seat
• clear instructions on the details to fill in on answer booklets
• use of the library barcode number instead of the seat number as an identity cross-check
• a place to write the seat number on the examination paper
• having a roll of student numbers and seating positions available
• that the examiners collecting the blue slips and checking the student card should have a list with student numbers and corresponding seats and check this as they collect the blue slips or during the examination
• students sit in any seat and invigilators write down the student number and seat number during the examination
• only one number on each desk
• no seating labels stuck to the front desks in a row as this annoys the students when they move their legs
• arranging seat numbers consistently either up or down each row, but not snaking up and down which is got confusing
• having student names or IDs written on the allocated desk

7.1.1.5 Arriving Half an Hour Early was Unnecessary

28 students were annoyed that they had been directed to arrive 30 minutes prior to the commencement of the examination. They remarked that it was not necessary and that supervisors did not let them enter the examination room any earlier than normal.

7.1.1.6 Invigilator Instructions

Three students reported that the invigilators had done a good job of explaining the process at the start of the examination, while two students reported that invigilators did not provide sufficient information. Interestingly both sets of comments applied to the same venues and hence the same invigilators.

7.1.1.7 Law Already Anonymously Assessed

Nine Law students remarked that they already had a process of anonymous assessment and that as it had worked well why should they have been involved in the Pilot, and in particular made to sit in allocated seats when this had not been the case previously.

7.1.1.8 Other Anonymous Assessment Issues

A number of students raised other issues related to the anonymous assessment Pilot:
• the chemistry exams (CHEM2210 – Winthrop Hall and CHEM2211 – Arts Lecture Room 5) were disrupted because the invigilators had distributed the non-anonymous answer booklets, and this had to be rectified after the commencement time, causing stress.
• the first answer booklet (ANIM3320 – Winthrop Hall) was the non-anonymous version, causing confusion as to whether the student name was required, however the second booklet was clear and only asked for the seat number.
• no papers were at the desk of a small group of students which caused some confusion to the staff and required filling out 8 - 10 papers in a shortened time (PHAR3301 – Winthrop Hall)
• the names of students and seats were printed and pasted on the front door (CITS3240 – ALR4)
• The examination commenced at about 1:52pm (8 minutes early), causing stress to students who arrived in time (LAWS2204 – Winthrop Hall).
• invigilators placing the slip with the web address of the feedback survey on desks over the top of students’ writing, in the last 10 minutes of the exam (LAWS2204 – Winthrop Hall)

7.1.1.9 Other Exam venue issues

A number of students raised other issues which were not peculiar to the anonymous assessment pilot but related to the conduct of examinations:
• the short answer questions required answers that could not be written down in the 15 mins allocated (MKTG2203).
• the exam was too long. 29 pages for a 2 hour exam (LAWS3364)
• if you schedule a 3 hour exam in the Undercroft, don't schedule a 2 hour exam for Winthrop Hall at the same time as the noise from people leaving the 2 hour exam sounds like the roof is about to collapse.
• desks in Winthrop Hall and the Undercroft are very crammed causing some sense of claustrophobia
• Winthrop Hall has some deficiencies:
  • It is a very cold and draughty in winter
  • it is hard to hear the exam supervisors in their broadcast instructions
  • it is hard to see the clocks
  • entry is congested due to only one set of doors
• abrupt and harsh invigilators (PSYC3315 - Fox Lecture Theatre and Arts Lecture Room 4, LAWS2204 – Winthrop Hall, HMES1101 – Undercroft), causing unnecessary stress.
• confusion for students between Winthrop Hall and the Undercroft venues
• difficulty in making sure that you are at the right paper sometimes when there are multiple examinations in one room. Maybe a sign with the unit code at the front of each row would help
• difficulty in finding the right room when an examination is scheduled in more than one room
• small and wobbly tables and cramped conditions in Arts Lecture Rooms 4 and 5
• mobile phones ringing in student bags are a major source of disturbance to students sitting in the vicinity of the bags. One student suggested that bags be tossed outside if they ring
• in Arts Lecture Room 4 there was a constant electronic buzzing which at times made it difficult to concentrate
• the chairs are uncomfortable (ELEC2303 - Fox Lecture Theatre and Arts Lecture Room 4)

7.1.1.10 Process Worked Well

6 students remarked that they found the examination process straightforward and that the seating plans posted up outside the venues were very useful.

7.2 Academic Staff Survey Results

All Academic Staff respondents felt that students had settled in well to the venues
All Academic Staff respondents indicated that their examination had commenced on time

7.2.1 Academic Staff Open-ended Comments

Academic staff made the following observations about the examination sessions:

- I was surprised at how well the students found their allocated seat in the examination venue
- Everything seemed normal, for the event.
- No students complained about the process
- Two students ended up in the wrong venue
• Several students seemed to have no idea about their allocated seat but had arrived early enough to receive instructions
• A couple of students seemed to find the process of locating their seat rather difficult.
• As far as the conduct of the Theory Paper examination went, no troubles were experienced

7.3 Professional Staff Survey results
Professional staff who were assisting students to find their seat number felt that students were not as prepared as they should have been.

Q5A Students came prepared with their seat number written down or memorised

Professional staff felt that there was a degree of confusion with students trying to find their seats.
Q5B Students were able to easily find their seat in the venue

Professional staff did not feel that Invigilators were well enough prepared to direct students to their seats.

Q5C Invigilators were well prepared for settling the students into their seats

Professional staff saw evidence of confusion and disquiet amongst many students.
7.3.1 Professional Staff Open-ended Comments

Professional staff made the following observations about the examination sessions:

- Some students do not know which venue they are in

7.4 Invigilator Survey Results

7.4.1 Commencement

Most invigilators reported that students did not come sufficiently prepared.
Invigilators felt that the changed procedures worked reasonably smoothly.

Invigilators felt that most students knew where they were to sit.
Q3C Most students seemed to know where they were to sit

Invigilators felt that helping students to find their seats was easy.

Q3D Helping students to find their seat number was easy

Invigilators reported that most examinations commenced on time.
Invigilators felt that students generally were able to follow instructions for filling in answer booklets and attendance slips.

Invigilators indicted that identifying those students who were incorrectly seated was an issue.
7.4.2 Invigilator Open-ended Comments

Invigilators made the following observations about the commencement of examination sessions:

- **Venue Not Declared**  
  Most students knew their seat numbers and as the week went on they became quite used to the new system. Just the occasional one who did not know that they had to sit in an allotted seat. It was time-consuming making sure students were in correct seats and venues. There was some confusion filling in registration slips with names and signatures - answer booklets were OK. The exams started on time after initial uncertainty on behalf of students and supervisors.

- **Winthrop Hall**  
  Some students had no idea where to sit as they didn't bring their number. Several times a student arrived to find someone in their seat but it was easy from the roll to identify who needed to be in which seat. Several times students were sitting in the wrong seat but because the person due there was absent it did not get found out causing upset at the end when ticking off papers. Most students remembered their number, but those students who forgot their number and didn't bother to ask were a problem, as they filled in the exam material whilst sitting at the wrong seat. However they were only a minority group.

- **Undercroft**  
  There was a little lack of understanding on the part of some students. It would be difficult and time consuming to make sure that each student was in their correct seat. If there is more than one exam in a room then seating can become difficult. This puts too much pressure on invigilators, especially the one in charge.
Due to students going to wrong venues exam starts were delayed. Both students and lecturers need to familiarise themselves with the venues and their locations. We were reliant on students knowing their seat number when they came into the venue. The extra staff outside the venue assisted greatly.

- **Fox LT**
  I have had students come into the wrong venue and sit at a vacant seat even when asked whether they were in the correct room and seat. On 3 occasions a student was in the wrong venue. On 1 occasion a student moved herself to the wrong seat. The supervisor displayed the seat numbers on the door and reminded students to check them. Unless there were 2 students for the same seat, the only way to check correct seating was to tick off every student against the roll, after the commencement of the exam.

- **ALR4**
  The allocated seating system stops would-be trouble-makers or cheats from grouping together. It is easier to identify students as they are sitting in the same sequence as the roll. The floor plan outside room is not necessary as the numbers are listed on the back wall. Access into the exam room is slower at commencement. It is hard to judge the timing for admitting students to the room. By bringing students in earlier there can be a longer sitting period before reading of instructions and start of exam. Students who come to the wrong venue and are not found before the exam commences are difficult to move. When for instance there are 30 students in a venue seating 64 they are all bunched up according to the seating plan from 1 to 30 where before they could spread out. Desks 25 and 33 in front of supervisors are now occupied where before they were left vacant (if possible) so students were not disturbed.

- **ALR5**
  Students did not have their seat number with them and only know where to sit by looking at list on door. Things improved in the second week. Students all looked at the door into venue and could check their seat number easily and knew where to sit.
8 Collecting and Collating the Scripts

8.1 Academic Staff

Markers agreed that they had received their scripts in good time.

![Graph showing responses to Q4A: I received my scripts for marking in good time.]

Most markers agreed that they had been able to manage the collecting and collating of scripts into bundles easily.

![Graph showing responses to Q4B: I was able to easily manage the collection, collation and sorting of scripts into bundles for marking.]

Academic Staff reported a slight increase in the amount of time spent or saved on collating examination scripts after the examination.

![Chart showing the amount of extra time saved or spent on sorting and collating exam scripts.]

Q4C The amount of extra time saved or spent on sorting and collating exam scripts was:

8.1.1 Marker Open-ended Comments

Markers made the following observations about the collection and collation of examination scripts:

- I think I spent an extra hour or so - however I am computer literate and thus could use vlookup etc on excel to address the couple of anomalies I came across easily.
- Extra time was needed to check and cross-reference long numbers rather than names as it takes extra time to read out numbers rather than just names and there is a higher likelihood of error (4 staff).
- Sorting of scripts into student number order is easier (2 staff).
- Collation and sorting was carried out by someone else - no problems were reported to me (2 staff)
- Not a large group of scripts, so not a major issue.
- It would be great if we could be given the formula that drives the checksum calculation for the last digit of the student ID. That way we could setup spreadsheets so they confirm that the ID we enter from the student script is a valid ID.
- The administration staff in Pharmacology sorted the scripts and started doing it before speaking to me about how best to approach it - therefore they spent more time than necessary and were stressed as a result. If they'd not tried to place the scripts in alphabetical order (as has been their habit with named scripts), there wouldn't have been any problems.
- Not a large group of scripts, so not a major issue.
- The seat number did not seem to assist much. They were allocated according to an ordering of the student numbers, so they offered little benefit.
- Seat numbers reduced anonymity as I found I was able to recall where certain students were sitting.
- In my case the exam was held across several venues, so seat numbers were duplicated.
- Several students got their student numbers wrong on the MCQ answer sheets (this happens anyway) - having the seat number as well was a necessary back-up
- There was only one paper out of order, I think caused by the student writing an incorrect seat number.
• The student taking the exam in a separate venue was not treated anonymously; his name was on the paper.
• I was concerned, when I picked the scripts up from the examination venue that I did not receive an attendance list. When the papers are returned to my office, I double check all scripts before they are distributed to the relevant markers and I had no check that my count was indeed accurate.
• I was not given an attendance list of the people who took the exam to cross check with the actual papers. Because of this four exams literally fell under the chair I was marking in and I did not find them until I cleaned the house. This meant filling out a change of grade form for each student.

8.2 Professional Staff
School administrative staff made the following observations about the collection and collation of examination scripts:
• Converting between alphabetical and numerical for checking was a pain.
• When the exam papers were received, we had no attendance record therefore we had to contact Exams Office to obtain this, causing a time delay in processing. Once the papers were marked by the examiner the inputting of the marks took longer than usual as we were inputting according to student number not name. This created further problems when students did not provide their correct student number as we had to spend more time correcting and cross checking. In addition, there was more data input required as we had to input the student's seat number and venue (alternative venues sat for same exam) in order to merge the multiple choice results with their short answer results to bring the marks together.

8.3 Invigilators
Invigilators were in agreement that collecting up and checking off scripts was easier as they were generally arranged in student ID order by virtue of the allocated seating.

8.3.1 Invigilator Open-ended Comments
Invigilators made the following observations about the completion of examination sessions:
• Venue Not Declared
  Definitely easier to collate into numerical rather than alphabetical order. Collecting the papers in larger venues may not be so easy as there is less room to move between rows - students are seated all together rather than spaced out as is usual.

• Winthrop Hall
  As long as papers were collected in strict numerical order it was easy. If we marked the master roll with A for absent students prior to ticking off the roll it worked very well. Seats not allocated caused minor confusion. Once we realised it could happen we were OK. Much quicker than sorting alphabetically

• Undercroft
  Finishing the exam was very easy for supervisors. OK except that some students tried to leave through the wrong door causing a strong wind on the pond side to upset our paperwork. The only exams where this incurred extra work and time were Law subjects. Normally we just count the number of papers and don't have to check off a roll. This system would work just as well on all exams, ie the Law system. By the end of the exam we already know how many papers there should be in each subject.
  A great system that reduces the work of supervisors at the end of the exam. Please let us do this as it provides cross checks that we would not otherwise take place.

• Fox LT
  In the smaller venues I guess this system was easier to run than a larger venue. Still the same amount of paperwork.

• ALR4
  It is easier to sort papers in numerical order than alphabetical.
  Suggestion 1: Assistant supervisor to have an alphabetical roll in hand at entry door to assist with seating enquiries, with Chief Supervisor to provide additional assistance inside the room.
  Suggestion 2: As soon as the exam starts Chief Supervisor to take the numerical roll and tick students seating off against the roll. This gives time to re-seat anyone in the wrong seat.

• ALR5
  No problems, but there was nothing wrong with the other system either.
9 Marking

9.1 Academic Staff Survey Results

Most markers felt that marking the scripts was no more difficult than normal.

Markers felt that the time spent marking anonymous scripts was the same as before.

Markers were equally split over whether it was better to have the scripts without student names.
Markers were evenly mixed about whether it was easier or not to enter the marks into a spreadsheet.

9.1.1 Marker Open-ended Comments

Six markers indicated that they preferred anonymous marking because:

- Unit (Named) is a moderately small unit with 50+ students - all of whom I know from labs and seminars. Thus, not knowing who had written specific scripts was very appropriate in this case. I cannot speak for larger class sizes.
- There is a benefit of anonymity for small units.
- It is fairer as the marker does not know the name of the students.
• it ensured the integrity of tutors assisting with the marking.
• Law has been anonymous for years - and it’s really the only way to go!

13 markers indicated that anonymous marking made no difference to their marking because:
• They either do not know or do not have time to look at the names on the papers, particularly for large units
• It is possible anyway to identify a number of students from seat number, writing style etc.
• Markers are professional enough that it doesn't matter if they know who's paper they are marking because they have a marking guideline and stick to it.

Seven markers indicated that they did not like anonymous marking because:
• It takes longer to cross-reference
• It is more difficult
• Not all students on the class lists had been printed with student numbers- this meant liaison with the admin officer.
• some student's numbers were almost indecipherable meaning they had to be identified by trial and error.
• Markers were not issued with sheets identifying who had attended the exam, so the indecipherable numbers were much harder to track down.
• Having the names is handy when they get their numbers wrong.
• Because students are seated in student ID order it is easy to identify the students by their seat number sequence.

9.2 Professional Staff – MCQ (Multi-Choice Question Sheet)

The scanning of the MCQ anonymous assessment sheets was problematic due to the large number of scanning errors and consequent manual intervention. For example the following rejection rates were experienced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Rejected Sheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MKTG2203</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT1112</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANHB2212</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cause of most of the papers having to be reviewed was that the unit name and number had to be written by hand on the paper – the computer programme could not recognise a large proportion of the handwriting. This was because the anonymous units were using a different program from the non-anonymous units. There is no reason why the same program could not be used for both, and this issue would not then arise.

Another problem was that students sitting the exam in alternative venues did not have the anonymous assessment sheet. The MCQ papers for these students were returned to the lecturer without being marked.
Combining Semester and Examination Results

10.1 Academic Staff Survey Results

Markers were slightly more likely to have found that combining the marks from the anonymous assessment with other semester marks was more time-consuming.

Two-thirds of marker respondents felt that support materials provided by SIMS/Examinations Office were useful in managing marks entry and combination.
A majority of markers reported that they had spent up to an extra five hours on entering and combining marks.

![Bar chart showing time saved or extra time spent on entering and combining marks.]

Q6D The amount of time saved or extra time spent on entering and combining marks was:

10.1.1 Marker Open-ended Comments

Markers made the following observations about combining semester and examination marks:

- It took longer to do it by student number (approximately one hour), requiring assistance from administrative staff, and is more prone to error (9 staff)
- There was extra checking required and extra possibility of errors in assembling the various components. The sort order in the lists from Callista is different from the standard alpha order from excel. For example O’ and On are reversed
- It was a bit more time-consuming to get all the marks combined, but the two different systems probably meant that I spent more time checking and therefore made fewer mistakes.
- I did not receive or use any support materials from the examinations office or SIMS (3 staff).
- I didn't use your system. Since I could identify the students I simply ignored everything and went about doing things as I always (very efficiently) do.
- Once the marks had been entered by student number they were matched to the corresponding student name, and the process continued as usual.

10.2 Professional Staff Survey results

Most School administrative staff found the process of combining semester marks with anonymous marks was more difficult and time-consuming.
Q6A Combining the marks from the anonymous examination with the marks from other assessment components was no more timeconsuming than normal

Staff spent up to an extra five hours combining marks.

Q6B The amount of time saved or extra time spent on combining marks was:

- Extra 10+
- Extra 5-10
- Extra 0-5
- Equal
- Saved 0-5
- Saved 5-10
- Saved 10+
11 Uploading Results

11.1 Professional Staff Survey results

Most staff felt that uploading the anonymous assessment marks was more difficult. This would have been because of the difficulty in combining the marks with semester marks, or matching in the names.

Most staff spent up to an extra five hours uploading marks.
Most staff felt that support provided by the Examinations Office/SIMS in the lead-up to the examination period was sufficient.

Three-quarters of administrative staff felt that the support provided by the Examinations Office/SIMS during the marks upload week was sufficient.
11.1.1 Professional Staff Open-ended Comments

The SIMS Training Officer indicated that he would have preferred a far earlier involvement in the process and consequently enough time to have been able to adequately prepare admin staff involved in the Pilot.
12 Thoughts on Anonymous Assessment

12.1 Student Survey Results

Approximately 70% of students felt that it is important that their assessments are marked anonymously.

![Bar chart showing student survey results for Q4A: It is important that my assessment tasks are marked anonymously.]

Approximately 60% of students felt that anonymity should apply to all assessments throughout the semester.
12.1.1 Student Open-ended Comments

12.1.1.1 Assessment Should be Anonymous

Assessments should be kept anonymous to prevent bias and provide a fairer system for all students, despite how professional a lecturer/tutor may be. In cases where a student has built rapport with a lecturer or tutor there may be the chance of some degree of partiality. Some students commented that they were concerned that lecturers may be offended by the implication of partiality accompanying the pilot. Five students claimed to have experienced bias in their marking (72 students).

Eleven students supported anonymous assessment for semester examinations only. They raised the benefits of personal interaction between student and lecturer/tutor during the semester continuous assessment.

Some students were appreciative of the fact that they did not have to write their names on the answer booklets, as this saved them considerable time during the examination (11 students).

12.1.1.2 Anonymous Assessment is Unnecessary

Students commented that the pilot was pointless and unnecessary, especially with large classes. Some students commented that markers behave in an unbiased manner currently, or that markers do not take any notice of their names, while some students commented that markers already know their students’ handwriting. Some students commented that for maths and sciences anonymity was not an issue (36 students).

Some students commented that they welcomed being known by the marker as this allowed the marker to take other factors into account when marking their paper which would lead to a fairer mark and markers would be able to provide early feedback. Some of these responses were probably in relation to continuous assessment and may not relate to semester examinations. (15 students)

12.1.1.3 Neutral Stance

As long as the markers act in an unbiased way then it is not necessary. Some students commented that they had had no reason to doubt that assessment was being carried out in an unbiased manner, while other students commented that the class sizes were so large that assessment was anonymous anyway (32 students).
12.1.1.4 Undecided Students

Students commented that they were undecided because they did not know what the pilot was trying to achieve, or because they felt that the methodology used was not robust and could not scientifically determine whether anonymous assessment provided a better outcome (8 students).

12.1.1.5 Assessment is not anonymous due to student number

Students remarked that the pilot did not provide true anonymous assessment because the lecturers have access to their student numbers and can look up their name if they want to, although some remarked that this would be unlikely. Also students observed that for very small classes the lecturers most likely know their handwriting. Some students noted that international students tended to be grouped together because of the pre-allocation of blocks of student numbers to the International Centre (44 students).

12.1.1.6 Law Students

Law already has anonymous assessment and this same process should continue and be expanded to include all examinations (17 students).

The existing anonymous assessment process for Law is sufficient and the additional requirement to be allocated to a specific seat is not required and adds unnecessary complexity. Students should be able to write their student number legibly and it is preferable for students to be able to select a seat that suits their requirements (position, stability of table etc) (24 students).

12.1.1.7 Alternative Examination Arrangements

Three students reported that for Alternative examination arrangements, anonymous assessment is not practicable, because individual arrangements must be made, and markers are in most cases aware of the identity and circumstances of the student.

12.1.1.8 Concerns about Mis-identification

Students raised concerns that if their name was not on the answer booklets their mark may be awarded to another student through mis-identification based only on a student number (10 students).

12.1.1.9 Unit-Specific comments

One student suggested that each unit co-ordinator should decide whether a unit would be assessed anonymously.

One student went even further and suggested that all the students in a unit should put it to a vote.

Nine students suggested that it was appropriate in the more subjectively assessed units, but not necessary for others.

Ten students proposed that only small units (less than 50 students) be assessed anonymously.

12.1.1.10 Concerns about cheating

One student observed that the system may be easier to cheat, and that consequently the mid-exam ID check may become more important.

12.2 Academic Staff Survey Results

62.5% of Academic Staff feel that anonymous assessment is not desirable.
Q7A It is important that assessment tasks are marked anonymously

Q7B Anonymous Assessment should apply across all assessment components throughout the semester

78% of Academic staff feel that anonymous assessment should not apply to continuous assessment throughout the semester.

12.2.1 Academic Staff Open-ended Comments

12.2.1.1 Comments Supporting Anonymous Assessment

- Five staff supported anonymous assessment, with one suggesting that major essays can be marked anonymously, one suggesting it apply to all components of assessment, one suggesting that end-of-semester examinations are purely for accreditation and hence anonymity is an advantage, and one suggesting it apply to small units.
12.2.1.2 Comments Not Supporting Anonymous Assessment

- 6 staff asserted that the “anonymous” assessment is not anonymous due to the use of the Student ID, and that use the term anonymous is misleading to students. However one staff member conceded that if it had been more anonymous it may have been more difficult to deal with administratively.
- 2 staff claimed that the “anonymous” assessment is not anonymous because staff know the students by name (and by handwriting, idiosyncrasies of expression, and in some cases from the last few digits of their ID's.
- Seven staff indicated that they are professional enough that student names will not affect their marking, with three of these expressing a feeling of offence at the implication that they would exhibit bias. One marker pointed out that a biased marker would still have the opportunity to exert that bias.
- Four staff suggested that for larger enrolments (say more than 100 students) assessment is effectively anonymous.
- Three staff indicated that there were sound pedagogical reasons for markers personally interacting with their students during the assessment process, allowing constructive feedback. One of these staff stated that 50% of the marks are for continuous assessment, so it makes little difference whether the exams are anonymous or not.
- Five staff pointed out that there is a significant additional workload and inconvenience in administering anonymous assessment and questioned whether the benefits outweigh the cost.
- Several staff suggested that anonymous assessment is unnecessary in science and mathematics units which are not subjective in their assessment.
- One marker claimed that the only real answer for anonymous assessment is to double mark.
- One marker cautioned that there are more likely to be errors in the entry and uploading of marks in the case of anonymous assessment.
- One marker suggested that the existing appeal process was sufficient protection against biased marking and suggested that there be a time scheduled after the results have been released to be available for formal feedback to students who request it.
- Seven staff strongly supported the notion that anonymous assessment should not apply to semester continuous assessment so that staff could assist students with their difficulties, and indeed that the personal interaction is an integral part of teaching quality (“The best feedback is face-to-face, so the teacher can look the student in the eye and see if they ‘get it’”). They also suggested that it would be practically impossible to manage the process of anonymous assessment for semester assignments.

12.3 Professional Staff Survey Results

88% of professional staff opposed anonymous assessment.
88% of professional staff opposed anonymous assessment of all assessment components.

Q7A It is important that assessment tasks are marked anonymously

Q7B Anonymous Assessment should apply across all assessment components throughout the semester
12.3.1 Professional Staff Open-ended Comments

12.3.1.1 Comments Supporting Anonymous Assessment

- Anonymous assessment should be applied to all forms of assessment in each unit.

12.3.1.2 Comments Not Supporting Anonymous Assessment

- There is little point in some units (e.g., languages) where the staff can immediately recognise the work of students.
- During the process of combining semester marks with examination marks, and prior to preparing an upload data file for SIMS, student names are matched against marks, negating any degree of anonymity which has gone before.
- Anonymous assessment may put into question the professionalism of the markers.
- To apply anonymous assessment to all components of assessment i.e., assignments, mid semester and final exams will generate additional workloads as the gathering, inputting, checking and returning of assessment will be cumbersome and time consuming.
- To change to a true completely anonymous assessment during a whole semester would require significant changes to on-going assessment business processes, marking processes and uploading processes which seems on the face of it to be far greater than any perceived impropriety would suggest is necessary.
13 Findings

The findings of this report are based on the analysis of the surveys, and are grouped into the same categories as above.

13.1 COMMUNICATION

There is no one best way to communicate information to students, and feedback from the Pilot has confirmed this. In any future projects of this nature it is imperative that communication be planned to include:

- email notices about the activity, and if important enough also a letter
- reminder emails on a planned schedule suit the important touch-points of the activity
- announcements made in classes (this will need to be done in a manner consistent with the information provided by the Examinations Office)
- instructions need to be very clear but not too long
- other communication channels such as ipoint, WebCT, web pages, studentConnect, and the Student Portal
- students must be reminded of their seat allocation when the timetable is released and also two days before each examination

13.2 TIMETABLING

Timetabling becomes more complex when allocated seating is added as a constraint. However seat allocation does have the benefit that examination script sorting by invigilators or Examinations Office staff is not necessary.

13.3 Answering Student Queries

If communication is improved student queries should diminish.

13.4 Examination Sessions

13.4.1 Venue Location

Students commented that they had trouble finding examination venues and in particular were confused between Winthrop Hall and the Undercroft. Also students reported that they had trouble locating the seats for their unit within the venue.

Better communication and signage needs to be provided for students so that they can more easily locate their examination venue, and within the venue locate their section of seats for their unit. The following measures would improve this:

- have clearly recognisable photographs and schematics of the examination venues and entrance doorways in studentConnect and iPoint
- have clearer signage within the venue indicating which rows of seats are assigned to specific units
- provide a list of student IDs and seat numbers outside the venue so that students can look up their seat number. Some students would consider that this was contravening anonymity

13.4.2 Venue Facilities

Facilities and the environment within the venues are not always optimal for the conduct of examinations. Students reported the following issues with venues:

- Desks were unstable
- The sunlight streams into Winthrop Hall
- Winthrop Hall is cold and draughty in the winter
- Some desks had more than one desk number
• At the completion of a two hour exam in Winthrop Hall there is a deafening noise heard in the Undercroft as students leave Winthrop Hall
• Multiple mobile phones ring constantly in student bags, disrupting those students seated in the vicinity

Venue facilities need to be improved including:
• desks to be checked for stability before each session
• sunlight screens for Winthrop Hall
• heating and cooling for Winthrop Hall
• avoiding scheduling a two-hour exam in Winthrop Hall when there is a three hour exam in the Undercroft. This is not practicable with the current limited availability of suitable examination venues and would mean standardising all examinations to two hours
• removal of student bags with ringing mobile phones

13.4.3 Allocated Seating

A larger number of students commented that they disliked allocated seating than those who supported it. Many of these students reported that it was stressful to have to look up and remember their seat number. Many students also tend to prefer to choose their seat within a venue for various reasons including:
• being near light
• being close to the clocks
• avoiding being hemmed-in by other students
• avoiding an unstable desk
• avoiding student traffic to the toilets

Those students supporting allocated seating remarked that it was one less decision they had to make when entering the examination room.

Invigilators found that not all students were aware of their allocated seat number and sat in the wrong seats, causing considerable disruption as they were sorted out during the commencement of the examination. They also reported that allocated seating causes bunching of small examination sessions within a venue, whereas previously they could spread the students out.

Academic staff reported that allocated seat numbers reduced anonymity because markers were able to recall where certain students were sitting.

Better communication should overcome much of the confusion about allocated seating, and over time students should become used to it.

Students presenting to a venue in which they have not been allocated a seat must be re-directed to the correct venue. Students presenting later than 30 minutes after the nominated start time must report to Student Administration

13.4.4 Answer Booklets and Student Identification

Several students reported that they preferred writing just their student number on their answer booklets as it saved time.

Students would like clearer instructions to be provided on what information needs to be written on answer booklets, the exam attendance slip etc

Students need to be reminded to bring their student card to each examination

It is recommended that:
• students write their student number and allocated seat number on the answer booklets.
• students also write their seat number on their attendance slip
• invigilators provide a clearer set of instructions to students on what information needs to be written on answer booklets, the exam attendance slip etc. This set of instructions is also to made available in studentConnect and iPoint.
• during the examination invigilators check student attendance slips and seat numbers against the roll and the student card
• students be reminded to bring their student card to each examination, and if they do not have it they must be directed to Student Administration

13.5 COLLECTING AND COLLATING THE SCRIPTS
Invigilators appreciated the ease with which scripts were collated at the end of the examination due to the fact that they were mainly pre-sorted into Student ID order by virtue of the seat allocation.

Some staff reported that they had not been provided with an attendance roll with the scripts and this meant that they were not able to confidently check of the scripts they had received.

13.6 MARKING
There was little difference reported in the marking of scripts. However some staff noted that it would be useful to be given the Student ID check-digit formula so that when they were keying in student IDs they can be verified. This highlighted that staff need some guidance into the most efficient way of managing scripts to facilitate data entry of marks.

It is recommended that:
• markers always be provided with an attendance list (student ID and seat number only) with their bundle of scripts
• markers are provided with training and documented procedures for the most efficient and accurate method of recording marks into a spreadsheet.

13.7 COMBINING SEMESTER AND EXAMINATION RESULTS
There were many problems experienced with the combination of anonymous examination marks with other semester results. This was mainly due to the fact that the anonymous marks had just the student number while the other marks had the student name as well as the number. Staff are clearly more comfortable and familiar with matching names rather than numbers when combining marks.

However there were a number of cases reported where marks were mis-matched (eg ANHB2212) because the sort sequence of names between two worksheets was different, usually due to names with apostrophes or blanks in them. For example O'Connor might have been at the beginning of the O surnames in one list and amongst the O surnames in the other because different software packages (eg Oracle and Excel) sort special characters such as apostrophes slightly differently. The root cause of this is that staff are using inappropriate methods for matching marks between worksheets. Marks should never be cut and pasted between sheets. Rather the Excel function VLOOKUP should always be used and based on matching the Student ID.

The staffConnect Anonymous Exam List download function was not capable of separating out the various examination papers (eg theory and practical) for a unit and this led to some confusion amongst staff.

It is recommended that:
• training programmes and procedures be prepared which guide staff through the most efficient and accurate way of managing examination scripts, entering examination marks and combining marks from multiple worksheets
• The staffConnect Anonymous Exam List download function be enhanced to separate out the various examination papers (eg theory and practical) for a unit.

13.8 UPLOADING RESULTS
There was little difference reported in the uploading of results once they had been combined.
13.9 THOUGHTS ON ANONYMOUS ASSESSMENT

Feedback on the principle of anonymous assessment comprised:

- 70% of students were in favour of anonymous assessment for the semester examinations
- 37.5% of academic staff were in favour of anonymous assessment for the semester examinations
- smaller units (< 50) are not really able to be anonymously assessed due to knowledge of student handwriting, styles etc
- larger units (> 100) are effectively anonymous anyway due to the reduced opportunity for academic staff to get to know the students in an individual way

13.10 FUTURE REVIEW OF ANONYMOUS ASSESSMENT

It is recommended that a review of anonymous assessment be carried out after five years of operation, and that a review of suitable technology such as bar-coded labels and barcode readers be investigated at this time.
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Memorandum

OFFICE OF THE PRO VICE-CHANCELLOR
(TEACHING AND LEARNING)

Associate Professor Jane Long
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)

Mail Bag M466
Extension 2077
Facsimile 1013
Email Jane.Long@uwa.edu.au

www.uwa.edu.au

Our Ref: F13621  23 November 2007

To: Heads of Schools
Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning)
Faculty Catalysts

Dear colleagues,

In early 2007 the University’s Assessment Standing Committee commissioned a small working party, convened by Professor Graeme Martin, to consider the issue of anonymous assessment in examinations. This deliberation was prompted by ongoing interest in anonymous assessment from both the Student Guild and other members of the university community over the past few years. The concept is not new: the Law School has anonymous examination protocols in place, and it is common practice in some universities. Anonymity in examination assessment was last considered at UWA in the 1990s, so revisiting the issue in light of a decade’s further research and practice is timely.

As one outcome of this deliberation, the Assessment Standing Committee is sponsoring a trial of anonymous assessment in examinations in a small sample of units, scheduled to take place in selected end of semester examinations in the first semester of 2008.

The trial will encompass a range of units from across the university, with the coordinators of particular units invited to participate. Suggested unit selection is based on a number of variables: class size;
year level; and exam venue configuration, for example. The trial will entail examination scripts using only student numbers, with no other identifying information, and which will be marked anonymously. The layout of examination venues will be altered, so students have allocated seating. On completion of marking, it will be possible to upload results on the basis of student number, hence no additional burden should be placed on school professional or academic staff in the recording of results.

In resource terms, every effort will be made to ensure the trial will have a minimal impact on workload. The Examinations Office will ensure that information is provided to all academic and professional staff whose work may be affected by the trial. Additional resources, such as new unit spreadsheets for Callista allowing anonymous examination scripts to be uploaded, and a User Guide for professional staff, will be provided by the Examinations Office.

We hope that a sample of unit coordinators probably representing a range of opinions about the value of anonymous assessment will agree to participate in the trial. In this manner, the trial, and the value of anonymous assessment in examinations, can be evaluated in a way which includes the perspectives of all stakeholders, from all faculties.

Mr John Murray, the Assistant Director from Student Information and Systems, will be contacting coordinators of units to invite them to participate in this trial in coming weeks. The attached plan for the implementation of Examination Script Anonymity includes an appendix highlighting units in your area which have been suggested for inclusion. I would note that this list is intended as a starting point for discussion with co-ordinators: participation in the trial is voluntary. However, I would again emphasise that the trial itself comes about as a result of strong representations from parts of the University, and I would welcome your support for the trial and encouragement for staff to participate. In particular, it may be useful to circulate the attached information concerning the proposed trial to coordinators in your area, prior to John Murray’s visits in the coming weeks.

After the trial, John Murray’s team will administer a range of surveys to elicit opinion about the trial, from participating staff and students. The results of that data collection will be reported to the Assessment Standing Committee and discussed fully within the University, before any changes to the University’s examination procedures are introduced, if any are recommended. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require further information about this initiative.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Long
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning),
Chair, UWA Assessment Standing Committee

Encl: Examination Script Anonymity – Business Impact Statement and Project Plan

cc Mr John Murray, Assistant Director, Student Information and Systems, M009
## Appendix B  Units Used in the Pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Unit Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCT1112</td>
<td>Management Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANHB2212</td>
<td>Human Structure and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM2203</td>
<td>Invertebrate Zoology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM3320</td>
<td>Comparative Neurobiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCT2210</td>
<td>Architecture: Modern History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL2261</td>
<td>Introduction to Conservation Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM2210</td>
<td>Structure Determination and Physical Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM2211</td>
<td>Synthetic and Materials Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN2201</td>
<td>Chinese Intermediate Bridging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITS2200</td>
<td>Data Structures and Algorithms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITS3240</td>
<td>Databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVL2121</td>
<td>Engineering Geology and Geomechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EART2201</td>
<td>Introduction to Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EART3320</td>
<td>Environmental Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON2201</td>
<td>Environmental Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEC2303</td>
<td>Embedded Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEC4302</td>
<td>Digital Microelectronics Systems Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMES1101</td>
<td>Human Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDNT1127</td>
<td>Foundations of Oral Biology Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMED3311</td>
<td>Foundations of Clinical Practice Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAL1101</td>
<td>Italian Beginners I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS1105</td>
<td>Criminal Law I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS2204</td>
<td>Property I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS3348</td>
<td>Remedies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS3364</td>
<td>Criminal Procedure: The Trial Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS4030</td>
<td>Commercial Practice, Conveyancing &amp; Drafting Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH1050</td>
<td>Calculus C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH2209</td>
<td>Calculus and Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECH3401</td>
<td>Thermofluids 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT8403</td>
<td>Economics For Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT8404</td>
<td>Data Anlys &amp; Dec. Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKTG2203</td>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC2101</td>
<td>Western Music History 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAR3301</td>
<td>Molecular Pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL1105</td>
<td>Introduction to Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLNT2201</td>
<td>Plant Physiology: Plants in Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC3315</td>
<td>Psychology: Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBH2206</td>
<td>Foundations of Epidemiology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C  Letter to Students

Mr Simon Jones
18 Smith Street
KARRINYUP  WA  6018

Our Ref: 12345678

Semester 1 2008 Anonymous Assessment Pilot

Information for Students

Dear Simon

Background

The UWA Assessment Standing Committee is sponsoring a trial of anonymous assessment in examinations in a small sample of units, scheduled to take place in selected end of semester examinations in the first semester of 2008.


Changes to Procedures

Examinations in units which are part of the trial will require that students do not write their names on the answer booklets. You will be allocated to a specific seat number within the examination venue and you will write your Student ID and seat number and venue on the answer booklets. The seat number and venue are required in the event that your student ID is either illegible or incorrect. The examination markers will receive the answer booklets and mark the papers without any easily recognisable identification. Written examination marks will be combined with other semester assessment marks using your student ID as the key.

Your Units

You have been scheduled in the Semester 1 examinations in the following units. Those examination sessions which are part of the anonymous assessment pilot are bolded and annotated with (Anonymous Assessment):

Course: 10110 Bachelor of Arts
PSYC3315 Psychology: Cognitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23-Jun-08</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Lecture Room 4 (Anonymous Assessment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSYC3318 Psychology: Perception and Sensory Neuropsychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-Jun-08</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Lecture Room 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Instructions for Examination Sessions

The following instructions apply to the written examinations for the anonymous assessment pilot units listed above.

Looking up your examination timetable

You will look up your examination timetable in studentConnect in the normal manner. You will notice that for the anonymous assessment pilot units you will be allocated to a seat number within the venue. See an example of a timetable with seat allocation at http://www.studentadmin.uwa.edu.au/page/147339#connect

Presenting at the examination venue

You will need to attend the examination venue at least 30 minutes prior to the commencement of the examination. It is most important that beforehand you print out a copy of your examination timetable showing your seat number so that you can quickly locate your seat.

Notices will be clearly posted outside the examination venue which will show the seat numbering plan for the venue. Seats will be numbered from 1 to 389 (for example, depending on the size of the venue) in rows within the venue and so you will be able to easily determine which row of seats you have been allocated. As with all other examinations, the group of students for each unit will be located in the same vicinity.

When requested to do so by the invigilators, move directly to your allocated seat within the row and sit down and await further instruction. You are not permitted to commence reading or writing until instructed to do so.

Staff will be available to assist you to your seat should you experience any difficulties.

Filling in the examination answer cover sheet and Examination Attendance Slip

You will be instructed by the invigilators to fill in your student number, seat number and venue on your examination answer booklets. See examples of the answer booklet and MCQ sheet at http://www.studentadmin.uwa.edu.au/page/147339#booklet

You will fill in your Examination Attendance Slip as usual with your name and Student ID and sign it.

Questions

If you have any questions about the process please email www.ipoint.uwa.edu.au.
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Appendix B – Email to staff

From: Harvey Von Bergheim
Sent: Monday, 2 June 2008 11:29 AM
To: arts-as@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; bianca howells; Deborah Rhys-Jones; eoliver; Felicia Symonds; Grant Revell; jan dunphy; Jane Emberson; Judy Fetherston; jgamble; jheyworth; jhopwood; Lisa Beckley; mheibloem; plloyd; Rachael Moorin; Sato Juniper; Stuart Broadfoot; vaficetta; zblair; admin officer; Anne Kealley; alice.evans@uwa.edu.au; Allan Mckinley; Alyson de souza; brownk@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; carol.brett@uwa.edu.au; catalano@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; catherine.vogel@uwa.edu.au; cdsouza@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; christine page; classics@mail.arts.uwa.edu.au; con@maths.uwa.edu.au; ctarpay@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; danste@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; diane valli; dklein@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; diff@chem.uwa.edu.au; dmorris@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; fjl@chem.uwa.edu.au; forensic@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; gabrielle.garratt@uwa.edu.au; glenys.walter@uwa.edu.au; helen reidy; hthoms@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; ib@chem.uwa.edu.au; Jan.Taylor@uwa.edu.au; jane@civil.uwa.edu.au; jay jegatheva; jenny.fo@uwa.edu.au; jking@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; jtaylor@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; jwoodman@arts.uwa.edu.au; kellie bennett; kerry Adams; leanne.lind@uwa.edu.au; lhil@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; Lidia Cuoco; lingua@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; list@maths.uwa.edu.au; margaret@ee.uwa.edu.au; mmahony@arts.uwa.edu.au; mmasel@arts.uwa.edu.au; mmirovsk@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; mose@cwr.uwa.edu.au; ophysiol@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; pama@ee.uwa.edu.au; pauline.ferguson@uwa.edu.au; plantsci@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; rany schnell; rowlands@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; sandra.pollock@uwa.edu.au; sfernandes@ohcwa.uwa.edu.au; sharon.hollman@uwa.edu.au; Sue Lewis; therese.ellis@uwa.edu.au; tracy.taylor@uwa.edu.au; uwalbany@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; uwazool@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; vicky.karagiannis@uwa.edu.au; wsander@cyllene.uwa.edu.au
Cc: admin-teaching@oil-gas.uwa.edu.au; afraser@meddent.uwa.edu.au; Anne Perryer; brenda churchill; claire mcgowan; David.Malthouse@uwa.edu.au; dbettis@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; dchenhal@biz.uwa.edu.au; Deborah Egan; diana djojan; dsymons@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; eccs@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; Econs student centre; eileen rowles; elizabeth.geelhoed@uwa.edu.au; emilyb@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; emma matson; erica@psy.uwa.edu.au; Gillian Walters; helen thoms; helen.friday@uwa.edu.au; helena iredell; helena@ph.uwa.edu.au; heulwen.schulz; Hui Chuiin Poa; inga car; international centre; imelda ooi; jan.burrows@uwa.edu.au; jane james; johannes@uwa.edu.au; jsthompson@uwa.edu.au; jwolff@uwa.edu.au; jzheng@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; karen lawson; kedhouse@law.uwa.edu.au; km@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; kgnish@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; kps@cms.uwa.edu.au; laurel ashon; lee hanrahan; lee.triplett; leena mitra; lesley hicks; linda creswel; lorraine dorn; lswan@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; Lesley Tubic; lydia@physics.uwa.edu.au; Marcia Choong; marisa gulluni; may.bond@uwa.edu.au; Melissa Gay Physics; mharvey@biz.uwa.edu.au; michael sutherland; michelle@ee.uwa.edu.au; natalia@maths.uwa.edu.au; natasha kepert; neil bryan; nicole crawford; nicole mccoy; pam bond; pamela@psy.uwa.edu.au; penny vincent; pmumford@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; pru.hodgkinson@uwa.edu.au; richard.small; Rochelle Horsley; ruth.abott@uwa.edu.au; sally furniss; Sally Sandover; satu stephenson; selenie.welsh@uwa.edu.au; sharon hyde; Siew Hong Wade; simy@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; slawrie; sonja dunning; spippet@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; stacee lucas; stephanie gee; tanya krnsik; terri-lee sculthorpe; Thea Eves; valerie williams; voula@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; wendy colangelo; A/Prof Dale Roberts (E-mail); A/Professor Michael Burton (E-mail); Assen Jablensky (E-mail); Brendan Waddell (E-mail); Brett Kirk (E-mail); Bruce Elliott; David Badcock (E-mail); David Forbes (E-mail); geoff soutar; head@civil.uwa.edu.au; head@ee.uwa.edu.au; head@maths.uwa.edu.au; Ian McArthur (E-mail); jill milroy; jkh@cyllene.uwa.edu.au; John Gordon (E-mail); John Newnham (E-mail); Lorenzo Faraoe (E-mail); music.head@uwa.edu.au; paul mcleod; philipw@sph.uwa.edu.au; pipma@arts.uwa.edu.au; Anthony Turner; Carol Sneddon; Donna Wallace; Fiona Godfrey; Haylee Gibbs; Janet Van Den Akker; Jeya Jeybalan; Judi Brkovic; Katie Jones; Leandira Corich; Michele Black; Robyn E Wilson; Samantha
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John Murray
Hi all

Please check the following website for information on the Anonymous Assessment Pilot Project - Semester 1 2008.


A letter will be mailed out tomorrow 3 June to students who are enrolled in units in the pilot project.

Regards

Harvey von Bergheim
Manager, Student Administration (Hackett Hall)
Mail Bag M356
The University of Western Australia
35 Stirling Highway
CRAWLEY WA 6009
Telephone: +61 8 6488 2468
Facsimile: +61 8 6488 1083
E-mail: harvey.von.bergheim@uwa.edu.au
http://www.studentadmin.uwa.edu.au
www.ipoint.uwa.edu.au

Office hours 8.30 am - 4.30 pm Monday to Friday

CRICOS Provider Code no. 00126G
### Appendix E  Survey of Supervisors

The University of Western Australia  
Anonymous Assessment Pilot Semester 1 2008  
Examination Supervisors’ Survey

Thank you for taking part in the Anonymous Assessment Pilot in Semester 1. In order to determine how successful the pilot was we would appreciate your feedback from the perspective of an Examination Supervisor. If you would like personal feedback on your comments please write your name in the space provided. All survey results will be reported to the UWA Assessment Standing Committee in aggregated form and your identity will not be disclosed.

1. Demographics

If you would like personal feedback on your comments please provide your name

Please list the venue(s) in which you were supervising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2A I was kept well informed of the Anonymous Assessment pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2B The information provided was clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2C Your comments on communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Communication

3. Commencing the Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3A Students came prepared with their seat number written down or memorised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3B I found that the changed examination procedures worked smoothly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3C Most students seemed to know where they were to sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3D Helping students to find their seat number was easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3E The examinations commenced on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3F Students were able to easily follow instructions for filling in their answer book cover sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3G Identifying that students were seated in their correct seats was straightforward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Finishing the Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4A Collecting up and checking off the scripts against the attendance rolls was easy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4B Your comments on finishing the examination
Dear Kath,

Here's a big item for our next T&L meeting. Would you put it on the agenda please? (Note there's a big report attached to the covering email below.)

Regards

Geoff

---

From: Kabilan Krishnasamy [mailto:Kabilan.Krishnasamy@uwa.edu.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 3 February 2009 10:26 AM
To: Bill.Taylor@uwa.edu.au; Alexandra Ludewig; Associate Professor Philip Hancock; Di Gardiner; angus.taverne@uwa.edu.au; peter.handford@uwa.edu.au; Geoff Hammond; naomi.trengove@uwa.edu.au; patrick.finnegan@uwa.edu.au; dorlinc.oxenham@uwa.edu.au; Mr Dominic Rose; Mr Dominic Rose
Cc: Jane E Long; Sue Smurthwaite
Subject: Anonymous Assessment - Feedback from faculty Teaching and Learning Committees
Importance: High

File Ref: F13621

Dear Associate Deans/ Members of the Guild Education Council:

By way of background, in early 2007, the Assessment Standing Committee of the Teaching and Learning Committee commissioned a small working party, convened by Professor Graeme Martini, to explore possible models of anonymous assessment which was anticipated to be implemented in UWA end of semester examinations. This deliberation was prompted by ongoing interest in anonymous assessment from both the Student Guild and other members of the University community over the past few years.

Following a series of discussion and debate on a number of related matters including associated costs, the working party was at the crossroads of deciding between two proposed models - either using student numbers or an alternative new number as the identifier on anonymous examination scripts. Given practical considerations, pursuing a trial using student numbers was assessed to be the most viable option.

At its meeting held on 22 November 2007, the Assessment Standing Committee approved the proposal that a trial of anonymous assessment be undertaken in a small sample of units, scheduled to take place in selected end of semester written examinations in the first semester of 2008. Suggested unit selection was based on a number of variables: class size; year level; and exam venue configuration, for example. The trial, which was sponsored by the Assessment Standing Committee, entailed examination scripts using only student numbers, with no other identifying information, and which was marked anonymously.

At its meeting held on 12 December 2008, the Assessment Standing Committee considered the attached report on the pilot of anonymous assessment. At the outset it should be noted that while the Anonymous Assessment pilot report makes recommendations on the technical aspects and possibilities of the process, it must be noted that, those technical possibilities notwithstanding, views within the committee concerning the pros and cons of anonymous assessment in pedagogical and administrative terms remain quite variable. It is clear that anonymous assessment throughout the university would entail a considerable shift in existing administrative practices and that within existing systems complete anonymity cannot actually be achieved. As such, reference to 'anonymous
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assessment' here and in the report, in fact describes assessment administration which is 'less readily identifiable than is currently the case', but is not anonymous. On the other hand, a similar form of 'anonymous assessment' has been utilised in the Law School for some time to the general satisfaction of students.

Feedback from the attached report itself is based on analysis of surveys conducted amongst students, academic staff, professional staff, and examination invigilators. A total of 3,956 students participated across 38 units in the pilot, with each student having one or more anonymous units as well as their normally assessed units. Approximately 70% of the students who responded to the survey felt that it was important that their assessments were marked anonymously. However, a significant minority of student respondents also reported that the pilot requirements contributed to a degree of anxiety prior to commencing an exam, as they navigated seating and other requirements. Academic staff who also participated in the pilot recognised that extra effort was required to manage anonymous exam scripts. The need for training of academic staff in best practices for combining examination marks with other semester marks was also noted.

From an administrative perspective, timetabling was viewed to be far more complex to manage with allocated seating arrangements. It was noted that late changes to timetables due to alternative arrangements for students in special cases (such as disabilities) caused a significant amount of manual effort in reallocating seating.

The report also identified the need to make further improvements in the following areas if changes to assessment based on the trial were introduced. These changes would include:

- Communication with students – although there is no one best way to communicate information to students, members agreed that communication must be planned to include email notices about the activity, reminder emails and any announcement made in class.
- Timetabling – the allocation of students to numbered seats within each venue should be an integral part of the timetabling process.
- Examination Sessions – it is recommended that
  o students write their student number and allocated seat number on the answer booklets. The seat number would facilitate the identification of students where they had incorrectly written their student number.
  o further training be provided for invigilators to assist them to provide a clearer set of instructions to students on what information needed to be written on answer booklets, the exam attendance slip etc. This set of instructions should also be made available in studentConnect and iPoint.
  o during the examination invigilators checked student attendance slips against the roll and the student card
  o students be reminded to bring their student card to each examination
  o in 2010 a review of suitable technology (such as bar-coded labels and barcode readers) be carried out to determine if there is at that time a cost-benefit to the anonymous assessment process

- Collecting and Collating the Scripts – it is recommended that
  o scripts would be sorted by the invigilators to ensure that all scripts were in student ID order and invigilators were to check off the sorted scripts against a roll in Student ID order to ensure that no scripts are missing.
  o markers would always be provided with an attendance list with their bundle of scripts

- Marking and Combining Semester and Examination Results – it is recommended that
  o markers would be provided with training and documented procedures for the most efficient and accurate method of entering marks into a spreadsheet.
  o training programmes and procedures be prepared which guide staff through the most efficient and accurate way of managing examination scripts, entering examination marks and combining marks from multiple worksheets
  o the studentConnect Anonymous Exam List download function be enhanced to separate out the various examination papers (eg. theory and practical) for a unit.

At its meeting held on 12 December 2008 the Assessment Standing Committee noted the conflicting outcomes for workload, staff and student experience indicated in the report itself which were consequent on the changes to assessment processes within the trial. It was therefore agreed as a way forward to send the report on the pilot of anonymous assessment to faculty Teaching and Learning Committees, via the Associate Deans, and the Guild for feedback specifically seeking your views concerning possible university-wide implementation of the proposed system of 'anonymous' assessment.

It is in this context that I write, in my capacity as the EO of the Assessment Standing Committee, to seek your assistance in placing this item on the agenda for discussion at your next Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee meeting.
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I would be most grateful if the respective Committees' feedback could be forwarded to my, via email, by Tuesday, 31st March 2009. Please let me know if this timeline does not suit you or if you need any further information.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks
Best,
Kabilan

Dr Kabilan Krishnasamy
Education Policy Services, M436A
Governance Services,
The University of Western Australia
35 Stirling Highway, Crawley 6009
Phone: (08) 6488 3213  Fax: (08) 6488 1075
Web: http://www.governanceservices.uwa.edu.au/
CRICOS Provider Code 00126G
Unit Information Management System

Briefing Notes

Background

A review of the management of unit information and unit outlines undertaken by the Faculty of Life and Physical Sciences (LPS) in July 2008, determined that unit information was best managed using a database system where staff are able to enter information directly onto a web based template. In the review, LPS staff indicated that they wanted a unit information system that was easy to use, automated, derived as much information as possible from other sources and did not require double entry of data.

Between 2006 and 2008, the Faculty had access to a web based facility for entering unit information directly onto a database. This facility, the Calliope Unit Outline Online Facility (Calliope) was introduced by the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) to:

- Provide a facility for easy access to unit outlines by UWA students (drawing from existing information, such as Handbooks)
- Support the needs of prospective international students via OUTWARD (http://www.admin.uwa.edu.au/ic/outward)

However, in November 2008 the TLC resolved to discontinue the use of Calliope on the recommendation of the Calliope Reference Group due to a lack of use by faculties. The LPS Unit Information Management Review determined that the lack of use by faculties was caused by poor implementation of Calliope across the faculties. It was also not made mandatory to use Calliope to display unit information on-line. The TLC resolved that faculties could either continue to use Calliope or to store unit outlines on their web pages until a proposed future system was developed and made available by Callista. The Director of Student Services has indicated the Callista development will not be available to the Faculty until the end of 2010 at the earliest.

Issues

With the withdrawal of the Calliope Facility and the delay of the introduction of the proposed alternative web based system, the Faculty faced the problem of continuing to manage unit outline ‘files’. The process is time consuming and the information stored in these files cannot be manipulated for other purposes or easily managed for quality control.

Solution

In collaboration, LPS and The Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (NAS) will build upon the Calliope System to develop a more robust, simplified and functional system. This new system, UIMS, focuses on the needs of the students and staff at the faculty and school level. The development phase is currently under way.

Benefits

The benefits of using a web based system that allows unit information data to be directly entered into a database by staff are:

- an easy portal for students to access standardised and up to date unit information
- better quality control over the information
- improved business process that will reduce the time spent by administrative staff managing unit information (it is estimated that the introduction of UIMS will save the Faculty around 400 hours of administrative time per year)
• a one-stop-shop for the management of unit information at the Faculty/School level
• flexibility in displaying information in the format required
• share information across different applications without the need to re-key information
• opportunities for future developments using the database and the data

Challenges

It will take time for the staff to accept UIMS after the false start with Calliope. A network of school administrators will be trained to use UIMS and offer support to unit coordinators using it.

Implementation

1. 6 Feb - Calliope renamed UIMS.
2. 6 Feb - UIMS available for staff to enter unit information
3. 9 Feb – UIMS demonstration
4. 12 Feb - Training session for all school UIMS administrators
5. 23 Feb - Unit Outline On-line www.unitoutlines.uwa.edu.au begins to display 2009 unit outlines as the teaching periods begin (2006-2008 unit outlines are also available).
6. May – System review from ongoing monitoring and evaluation. All stakeholders will be asked to participate in a survey. A second development phase will then follow.
Post graduate Research completed as a paper or series of papers.

Information supplied by Graduate Research & Scholarships Office (February 2009)

Re the rules for submission of a thesis as a series of papers are the same for both PhD and Masters Candidates. They are copied below, as well as the rules on word limits. The rules can be found at http://rules.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/rules/GeneralRules/Part3/Division1

There is also some useful information on the thesis as a series of papers at http://www.postgraduate.uwa.edu.au/studentnet/thesis/series

1.3.1.33(1) A thesis may be presented in the form of a typescript, a published book or a paper or series of papers which have been published in refereed journals.

(2) If any of the items submitted in terms of (1) have been jointly authored—

(a) the work done by the student must be clearly indicated and certified as such by the co-authors; and

(b) the co-authors must certify that they agree to the inclusion in the thesis of work of which they are joint authors.

(3) A publication of which the student is sole or joint author may be submitted as an appendix in support of the thesis, but, in the case of joint authorship, the work done by the student must be clearly indicated.

(4) If a series of papers is presented, there must be a full explanatory introduction and a review article at the end to link the separate papers and to place them in the context of the established body of knowledge.

(5) If detailed data and descriptions of methods are not otherwise given, they must be included as appendices.

(6) If, with the approval of the Board, the thesis is presented as a typescript in two parts comprising respectively a piece of creative writing and exegesis, the two parts must be strongly connected and the connection must be demonstrated clearly in the exegesis.

1.3.1.34 A thesis must include a summary of approximately 250 words.

1.3.1.35(1) If a thesis is in typescript it must be typed on A4 size paper (30 cm x 21 cm) with a margin of 4 cm on the left-hand side of the page.

(2) If a thesis is part in print and part in typescript, the Board, in consultation with the University Librarian, may grant permission for the pages to be of a size other than A4.

(3) No specific restrictions are placed on the size of drawings or maps accompanying a thesis.

Word Limits

1.3.1.36(1) Except as provided in the rules for individual master's degrees, a thesis, including footnotes but excluding words in tables, maps, endnotes, bibliographies, appendices and other illustrative matter, normally must not exceed—

(a) for the degree of master by research, 50,000 words; or

(b) for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 100,000 words. Students preparing theses for the Doctor of Philosophy are encouraged to prepare theses of no more than 80,000 words, notwithstanding that they may submit theses of up to 100,000 words without the requirement to seek special approval.

(2) If it appears that a thesis is likely to exceed the word limit specified and the Graduate Research Co-ordinator/head of school concerned judges that there are good reasons for this, the Graduate Research Co-ordinator/head of school must submit a written case for approval of a thesis exceeding the standard limit for the consideration of the Board.

1 Subject to Senate approval.