

Assessment and Marking Process Changes – Impact on National Results Profile

Borderlining

Introduced: 1st phase - 1995; 2nd phase - 2004 (KS3 English only); 3rd phase - 2005 (KS3 English only)

Removed: 2008

Description: 1st phase - Each script 1, 2 or 3 marks below a level threshold is reviewed by the original marker; 2nd phase - Scripts which are 1, 2 or 3 marks below a level threshold are collected from the markers and reviewed by a different marker; 3rd phase – Scripts which have been through QAC and are 1, 2 or 3 marks below a level threshold are reviewed.

Impact: Nationally, since 1999 the mean impact of borderlining across all levels for KS2 are increases of 1.2 percentage points in English, 0.2 percentage points in mathematics and 0.6 percentage points in science. For KS3 the increases are 1.0 percentage points, 0.2 percentage points and 0.4 percentage points respectively.

Component Marking

Introduced: 2004

Description: Separate marking of KS3 English reading and writing scripts.

Impact: No evidence but thought to be negligible. Intended to increase marking reliability since markers were focussing on fewer questions.

Quality Assurance Centres (QAC)

Introduced: 2005

Description: Key Stage 3 English scripts reviewed by marker panels.

Impact: Little evidence but thought to be negligible at a national level.

Level Setting – Independent reviewer

Introduced: Final – 2001; Draft – 2006

Description: Independent reviewer to assist final level setting meetings and draft level setting meetings.

Impact: Unlikely to have impacted on results, but was intended to provide greater confidence in the level threshold setting decisions

Level Setting – Teacher Judgement Element

Removed: 2006

Description: The teacher judgemental exercise was a process involving teachers providing information to assist in level setting. The process was removed from the level setting process following consultation and agreement with the regulator.

Impact: Thought to be negligible since the evidence had not impacted on level threshold setting decisions for some years.

Level Setting – Use of larger sample of live data for impact analysis

Introduced: 2008

Description: A large sample of live data will be used for the impact analysis in final level setting, instead of a much smaller sample of data used previously.

Impact: None, but will increase confidence that the impact of level threshold setting decisions is fully understood

Change in standardisation process

Introduced: 2008

Description: In previous years, the standardisation process by which markers were cleared to mark was linked to the sampling process, whereby marking quality was judged by supervising markers (team leaders) individually. From 2008, standardisation will be against an agreed national standard.

Impact: No evidence from live marking but intended to improve consistency of standardisation and therefore marking.

Introduction of benchmarking to replace sampling

Introduced: 2008

Description: As described previously, sampling was undertaken by team leaders leading to potential for inconsistent quality assurance of marking. Sampling occurred at least twice during the marking process. Benchmarking, in which a number of scripts are marked by a marker at regular intervals during the marking process, will be against an agreed national standard. Benchmarking will occur at least 4 times during the marking process.

Impact: No evidence from live marking but intended to improve consistency of marking.

Introduction of online mark capture

Introduced: 2008

Description: In previous years, once a marker had completed marking, they were responsible for adding up the total score, assigning a level and transferring the information to a paper marksheet. This data was then sent for data capture and electronic files returned to schools after the scripts had been returned. The introduction of online mark capture means that markers will input the data into an online system which will automatically sum the scores, assign a level and prepare an electronic results file.

Impact: No evidence from live marking but intended to reduce the possibility for error in addition, transcription and assigning of levels

National Assessment Agency (NAA)

Data Services Group, DCSF

June 2008