

Setting, Moderating And Marking University Examinations: A Comparative Review of Policies from Universities in East Africa and United Kingdom

Edwin Andama Ombasa

College Of Education And Lifelong Learning, Kenyatta University

Abstract- Universities especially in Africa are today faced with the challenge of producing competent and highly skilled manpower necessary to serve the needs of humanity in the 21st century. The quality of assessment in these institutions could play a major role in the realization of this role. The United Kingdom is home to not only the oldest but also the best universities in the world. The East African Community on the other hand being a region in Africa may not be famed for this characteristic. In fact, studies have shown that a number of universities in the region — Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Burundi, Rwanda and South Sudan are faced with a number of challenges related to the quality of education that takes place in these institutions. Consequently, this necessitated the current study which sought to investigate the nature of the examination policy framework in these institutions with the view of establishing similarities, differences as well as possible weaknesses inherent in some of these policies. Research methodology involved a content analysis of policy documents. Findings: there exist a number of differences in policies on setting university examinations. In Uganda Martyrs University for instance, the policy does not specify who is supposed to set examinations. On the other hand, in a university like Manchester Metropolitan, policies on examinations are guided by the Quality Assurance Agency's UK Quality Code — a practice that is not common in other universities from the United Kingdom as well as in East Africa. The study established a number of differences in policies on moderation of examinations. For instance, unlike in other universities, policies in the University of Eldoret specify timelines within which various activities on moderation are done. In marking, University of London is the only university whose policies clearly state what should be done when examination irregularities are detected during marking. A number of similarities were noted with regard to setting of university examinations. In almost all institutions, it was established that end of semester examinations are set and typed by a member of staff who taught that specific course. In moderation, it was common practice that examinations have to be moderated both internally and externally before they are administered. On the other hand, it was common that both internal and external examiners take part in marking-related activities. Recommendations: universities should clearly state in their examination policies on how cases of examination irregularities should be handled when detected during marking. They should also formulate new policies to allow for Conveyor Belt System of marking.

Index Terms- examinations, marking, moderating, policies, setting

I. INTRODUCTION

According to Ogula et al. (2006), examinations are an essential part of quality teaching and learning. In any quality assessment, there has to be an objective of each assessment, topics and sub-topics to be covered. There ought to be a variety in question types reflecting all areas of the course outline. Hughes (1989) argues that to enhance reliability in examination marking, adequate training of markers, detailed marking schemes and double marking or benchmarking are very essential.

Johnson (2001) identified four principles that make a good examination: content validity, scorer reliability, discrimination and objectivity. Content validity — should be a representative sample of the content of the whole course. Scorer reliability — if two markers mark the same examination script, they should arrive at similar scores devoid of huge deviations. For an examination to have reliability, the same examination should give similar results if it is to be taken on two different occasions and questions should be clear and unambiguous. Having a good marking scheme ensures reliability of marking. It should specify the range of responses expected and the mark allocation for each question should be commensurate with the demands of the question. Discrimination — examination items should be able to differentiate between achievers and weak students. Objectivity — examination should be fair to all students and give them equal opportunities regardless of age, gender, religion or any other natural distinction. Identifying students by say index number rather than their names reduces subjectivity in marking.

A study by Oluoch (2014) established that some tutors do not get opportunities to attend induction seminars and workshops. In addition, new tutors who join institutions of higher learning or those with little or no teaching experience tended to experience difficulties in handling examinations. It was in the context of this situation that the current study emerged to make a comparative exploration of the policy environment of university examinations with a view of addressing some of the challenges identified by Oluoch. The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Identify similarities and differences existing in policies that guide the setting of examinations in universities in East Africa and United Kingdom.

2. Identify similarities and differences existing in policies that guide the moderation of examinations in universities in East Africa and United Kingdom.
3. Identify similarities and differences existing in policies that guide the marking of examinations in universities in East Africa and United Kingdom.

II. SETTING OF UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS

This is the process of preparing questions to be used in assessing content learnt (Ogula et al., 2006). Ogula is of the view that it is common that academic staffs are responsible for producing their own examinations together with their marking schemes and thereafter send copies of these to external examiners for moderation. Ogula goes ahead to say that examination papers and marking schemes should be set, internally moderated, vetted by the external examiner, printed and proof read at the appropriate time.

In producing quality examinations, if an examiner wants to use color in their questions, they should make sure that this does not disadvantage color blind students. They should also ensure that their choice of question style avoids an excessively high standard deviation in the students' marks. This generally results from papers where hard-working but weaker students can find nothing to answer. They should set questions where weaker students can do at least part of the question. When doing this, examiners should try to make their questions coherent and progressive, rather than a sequence of disjointed and unrelated parts. Besides, they should ensure that questions are not all directly lifted from classroom notes.

When setting examinations, the setter should give guidance to the students by asking themselves these questions: do students understand what is expected of them in the examination? Do they understand the level of detail and accuracy required in a good answer? Do they know the format or areas to be tested? On the other hand, Ogula et al., (2006) says that given that members of university academic staff write their own examination papers, it is vital that they proof-read their examination questions carefully to ensure that there are no errors.

According to Bloom (1994), quality examinations should incorporate Bloom's six cognitive domains of knowledge: *knowledge* — ability to remember facts, terms and basic concepts without necessarily understanding what they mean; *comprehension* — ability to demonstrate understanding of facts and ideas by organizing, comparing, interpreting and describing the main ideas; *application* — ability to use acquired knowledge to solve practical problems in new situations; *analysis* — ability to examine and break information into component parts, determining how the parts relate to one another, identifying motives or causes and making inferences and find evidence to support generalizations; *synthesis* — ability to build a structure or pattern from diverse elements and putting parts together to form a whole; *evaluation* — ability to present and defend opinions by making judgments about information, validity of ideas or quality of work based on a set of criteria.

III. MODERATION OF UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS

Moderation is the process of ensuring that assessments are marked in an academically rigorous manner with reference to agreed marking criteria (Hughes, 1989). Universities accept variety in moderation practices by recognizing the varying demands of different disciplines and the different requirements of various types of assessed material. Hughes argues that Colleges should choose the most appropriate practices for their programs from models of moderation using agreed criteria.

Good moderation practices should: seek to ensure accuracy and fairness; be appropriate and acceptable to the discipline being taught; be suitable to the material being assessed; be suitable to the means of assessment being used; and be clearly evidenced in the feedback provided to students. In most universities, moderation policies apply to all aspects of student assessment that contribute to the award or final classification of an award, including: conventional examinations, formally assessed coursework such as projects or dissertations and laboratory or any other practical work (Johnson, 2001).

According to Johnson (2001), there exist a variety of models of moderation. Examples are: *universal double blind marking* — the first marker makes no notes of any kind on the work being marked and the second marker examines the work directed by independent judgment. Later, both examiners award marks and make comparisons; *universal non-blind double marking* — the first marker provides feedback for the student on the assessment and the second marker assesses the work with this information known but without accessing marks awarded by the first marker; *moderation of the entire cohort as check or audit* — the first marker provides feedback for the student and awards a mark; *moderation by sampling of the cohort* — the second marker samples work already first marked with feedback for students and marks attached, in order to check overall standards; *partial moderation* — any of the above may be applied to particular types such as fails, firsts or borderlines.

IV. MARKING OF UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS

Ogula et al., (2006) defines marking as the process of judging the correctness of a student's academic work based on a specified criterion. Marking criteria have categories such as from 70 % to 100 %, from 60 % to 69 %, from 0 % to 39 % and so on. Marking advice is usually made available to markers in relation to all forms of assessment used within Schools or Departments. In pursuit of assessment practices that are fair, valid and reliable universities apply double-marking (preferably "blind" where the first mark is not made known to the second marker). Besides this, for formal written examinations most universities operate anonymous marking system.

CASE 1: UGANDA MARTYS UNIVERSITY

This is a private university located in Nkozi town, Uganda. It was established in 1993 by the Roman Catholic Church in Uganda. By 2014, the university had a population of slightly over 5, 000 students and over 400 administrative staff. The university operates a total of nine campuses among them the main campus in Nkozi, Lira, Mbarara and Mbale campus. It was randomly sampled because it is located in one of the countries of

East Africa — Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, South Sudan, Rwanda and Burundi. The following section highlights the policies that guide examination processes in this university.

Setting of examinations

1. Quality assurance mechanisms for determining student assessments, both continuous and final shall be developed.

Moderation of examinations

1. Uganda Martyrs University shall establish a systematic mechanism for the internal and external moderation of examinations. Guides for examinations and coursework moderation and external examiners shall be developed and followed accordingly.
2. In the absence of external examiners, departments shall develop systems that are coherent with the quality assurance framework approved by University Senate. These shall include a minimum of internal moderation procedures that ensure validity of student assessment and reliability of marking and a maximum of external examination.
2. Moderators shall be required to be academically competent in the field they are called upon to moderate. Their primary concern according to the policy is to check the accuracy of the examination papers, their suitability and relevance for the level for which they are intended to be addressed.

Duties of moderators before examinations are done (pre-examination period):

- i. Moderating all examination questions, paying attention to language use and spelling.
- ii. Moderating the marking scheme with regard to and allocation of marks and scoring criteria.
- iii. Moderating the general instructions on the front cover of the question paper.
- iv. Ensuring that there is a balance between time allocated for the paper in relation to the questions and marks allocated.
- v. Ensuring that special tables, formulae and other technical documents accompanying the question paper are available.
- vi. Editing and suggesting improvements to the questions in collaboration with the examiners.

Duties of moderators during examinations:

- i. They shall be available to attend to any query from candidates in case the examiner is not around for whatsoever reason as well as provide any assistance as may be required.

Duties of moderators after examinations are done (post exam period):

After all examination scripts have been marked, the moderator shall:

- i. Check if the marking scheme/indicative marking criteria has been strictly followed.
- ii. Check if all questions are properly marked and marks entered on the performance sheet.

iii. Check the accuracy of all totals.

iv. Report to the Administrative Officer in charge of examinations through the Dean/Director on any anomalies noted.

Marking of examinations

1. Uganda Martyrs University shall establish a Board of Examiners consisting of internal and external examiners for each program on offer. The Board of Examiners shall determine whether a candidate has successfully completed or failed an examination on the basis of the set pass mark.

CASE 2: UNIVERSITY OF ELDORET

This is a public university situated in Eldoret town, Kenya. The university was founded in 1946 by white settlers as a large scale farmers' training center before becoming a fully fledged university in 2013. Currently it has over 33, 000 students pursuing various programs. It was sampled purposefully because it is one of the many universities that have acquired charters recently and therefore one of the growing academic institutions in the country. The following section highlights the policies that guide examination processes in this university.

Setting of examinations

1. University of Eldoret examinations in collaborating institutions shall be set, invigilated, marked, moderated and released by the relevant schools.
2. Setting and typing shall be done by the course lecturer (internal examiner).
3. Lecturers responsible for a course shall set questions for regular, supplementary and special examinations and prepare marking schemes within the first four weeks of the semester.

Moderation of examinations

1. Departmental Board of Examiners consisting of the Dean of School, Head of Department, Examination Coordinator and Timetable Coordinator shall moderate papers internally before sending them to External Examiners.
2. A copy of the question papers with marking schemes and course outlines shall be sent to External Examiners for moderation.
3. Heads of Departments shall ensure that comments from External Examiners are discussed and incorporated into the question paper by Internal Examiners.
4. The Principal Internal Examiner or Head of Department shall send copies of moderated examinations to the registrar in charge of academic affairs for reproduction and safe custody five weeks before the start of regular examinations.
5. All copies of draft examination papers except the moderated ones shall be destroyed by shredding.

Marking of examinations

1. Internal Examiners shall mark and enter Continuous Assessment Tests (CATs) as well as regular examination marks and submit them to the Principal Internal Examiner six weeks from the last day of the semester examinations.

2. All the examination individual mark sheets shall be accurately completed, checked and signed by the internal examiner, the Head of Department and the Dean of the School.
3. Examiners shall not divulge marks to candidates.
4. Internal examiners shall mark scripts on a semester basis and release examination results to the Head of Department within a period of two weeks after the end of the examinations.
5. The Head of Department shall forward examination results to the respective Deans who shall relay provisional results to senate for consideration and approval. Senate shall accept, vary or modify provisional examination results presented to it.
6. After release of provisional results, a candidate may appeal for remarking within a period of two weeks through the Dean of School and a copy sent to the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of academics giving reasons thereof.
7. A fee of five hundred Kenya shillings per paper shall be paid for remarking.
8. The Dean, in consultation with the Head of Department, shall nominate an independent examiner who had not taught or examined the candidate in that particular course to remark the scripts and forward marks to the Chairperson of Senate for consideration through the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of academic affairs.

CASE 3: ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

The university is private and it was established in 2007 by the Anglican Church of Tanzania. It is located in Dodoma city, Tanzania. The university has a population of over 4, 500 students. It was sampled randomly to represent universities in Tanzania. The following section highlights the policies that guide examination processes in this university.

Setting of examinations

1. The process of examining shall be done under maximum confidentiality and integrity. The staff member setting the examination papers shall be responsible for the security of the papers.
2. Two papers shall be set for each course. One will be randomly chosen by the Head of Department for use in the university examination. The one not used for the first sitting shall be used for any supplementary and or special examination that shall be offered.
3. All examinations shall be set by a member of the academic staff who coordinated the course or by the Head of Department.
4. An external examiner shall be a reliable person competent in the subject area and not an employee of St. John's University.
5. External examiners shall be appointed by the Dean of School, Director of Institute or Center, subject to approval by senate.

Moderation of examinations

1. All examinations shall be internally moderated in the presence of the staff member responsible for the paper or by at least one appropriate senior member of staff.
2. The final version of examination questions and the authorized syllabus shall be moderated by the External Examiner in the second semester of every academic year during the process of moderating the marking.
3. All examinations set by internal examiners shall be externally moderated in second semester of every academic year.

Marking of examinations

1. All tests, assignments, semester papers and other forms of assessment done during the semester shall be marked before examination week by the internal examiners.
2. Marking of all examinations and the compilation of results shall be done by internal examiners in accordance with a time schedule given by the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of academic affairs.

CASE 4: MANCHESTER METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

This is a public university located in Manchester city, United Kingdom. The university was established in 1970 as a polytechnic before gaining university status in 1992. By 2016, it had a population of 32, 485 students, hence making it the fifth largest university in UK by student numbers. This was the main reason why it was purposefully sampled for the study. The following section highlights the policies that guide examination processes in this university.

Setting of examinations

Policies on university examinations are developed in line with the Quality Assurance Agency's UK Quality Code.

1. Assignment briefs shall be verified before being given to students. This verification shall consider the consistency of the assignment task in relation to other units at the same level in the same discipline, check that the learning outcomes will be fully addressed by the task and that the marking criteria conforms to those in the program specification and that the feedback strategy fits with the program and the university's policy.
2. This internal verification shall be done by a member of staff who does not directly contribute to that particular assessment.
3. External verification shall be done by the subject's external examiner. This examiner shall look at a sample of assignment briefs which is sufficient to confirm the currency, appropriateness and standards shown by the brief.

Moderation of examinations

Internal moderation of marking:

1. It shall involve a review of a sample of marks and comments on assignment tasks to ensure that marking criteria have been fairly, accurately and consistently applied during first marking.
2. It shall be done by colleagues from the discipline.

3. Moderation may begin before all of the work for a cohort has been assessed, provided that a reasonable sample is available which represents a range of marks and if possible, markers.

External moderation of marking:

1. External moderators shall do a review of a sample of marked and submitted work by the appointed external examiner for the program or subject.
2. External examiners shall not be involved in the determination of marks for individual students but rather provide the program team with an external, independent overview of their marking processes and the fairness and effectiveness of these processes.

Marking of examinations

Since examination scripts are not routinely shared with students, the marker does not need to write detailed feedback on the scripts except insofar as it may help with showing how marking decisions were made. Besides this, the marker shall initial each page to indicate that it has been marked, and to initial the final mark box to indicate that it has been checked.

1. First marking

First marking shall involve judging student responses against the criteria in the assignment brief. Marking of examinations shall be routinely made anonymous.

2. Second marking

It shall be required for assignment tasks which exceed 30 credits in value and recommended for 4 others. Second marking shall take any of these three forms: Independent marking – where the second marker marks the assignment exactly as it was submitted, with no comments appended by the first marker and no access to the marking and feedback comments provided by the first marker; Team marking – where two or more markers work together in making judgments and providing feedback on submitted work; Seen marking – when the second marker marks the assignment with access to the marks and feedback provided by the first marker.

3. Third marking

Third marking shall be considered when second marking results in a significant difference between marks awarded by the two markers and the markers are unable to agree on a final mark. It shall be necessary to consult with external markers at this point but external examiners shall not act as second or third markers. Their role shall only be limited to moderation of the process.

CASE 5: UNIVERSITY of LONDON INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY

The university is located in London city, England. It is a public university with a population of over 54, 000 students spread out in over 180 countries. It was established in 1858. Its affiliated institutions of higher learning include Kings' College London, London School of Economics, UCL Institute of Education and Heythrop College. It was sampled purposefully because it is one of the oldest universities in not only UK but also the world, and therefore an institution with stable systems. Besides this, the researcher chose it because it offers its programs internationally. The following section highlights the policies that guide examination processes in this university.

Setting of examinations

1. Internal Examiners shall participate in setting examinations and shall be expected to attend any meetings of the Examination Board held to determine the outcome of examinations.
2. External and intercollegiate Examiners shall be invited to participate in the setting of examinations.
3. Every examination paper shall be approved by at least one external or Intercollegiate Examiner.

Moderation of examinations

1. External Examiners shall be appointed to take part in moderation of examination scripts.

Marking of examinations

1. Every examination script shall be marked by at least 2 examiners or by one assessor and one examiner, who shall thereafter prepare an agreed list of marks.
2. The Chair of the Board of Examiners shall assign examiners into pairs for the purpose of double marking and shall ensure that the performance of pairs of Examiners is monitored by the Board.
3. Where both first and second marks are known to examiners, they must report to a Chief Examiner or chair on any significant difference which can't be resolved with the other marker.
4. Associate Examiners shall be qualified and experienced colleagues who shall not be employees of the University and shall be appointed to mark examinations in line with university policy.
5. Assistant Examiners shall be appointed to assist in marking scripts where there are large numbers of candidates.
6. The University and all Examiners shall be required to comply with the Data Protection Act of 1998 which establishes legal rights for individuals with regard to the processing of their personal data, including examination results.
7. Examiners shall be vigilant in their assessment of all elements of the examination for instance irregularities (collusion , impersonation or presentation of unauthorized material) and shall refer it to the Senior Assessment Manager in charge of examinations.
8. Examiners shall be responsible for agreeing the final mark of each element of assessment and ensuring the correct recording of marks on all scripts and mark sheets presented to the university.
9. Where there is divergence of opinion between examiners and in the mark awarded by each, Examiners shall be required to display how those differences were resolved.
10. Examiners shall ensure the confidentiality of candidates by making reference to the candidate number only in all documentation.
11. External/Intercollegiate Examiners shall inspect all scripts and other examination-related materials to be able to assess whether marking and classification are of an appropriate standard and consistent. This shall include: a sample of scripts from the top, middle and at the bottom of the range.

12. On illegible examination scripts: If an examination script is illegible or incomprehensible by the markers, the following procedure shall be followed:
- If the first pair of markers is unable to understand the relevant text, it will be referred through the Chair of the Board of Examiners to a second set of markers.
 - If the second pair of markers is unavailable, the Chair of the Board of Examiners shall refer the script to an External or Intercollegiate Examiner.
 - If the second pair of markers (or External/Intercollegiate Examiner) is also unable to read the text, a mark of zero shall be awarded for those parts.
 - If a candidate is awarded a zero mark on the above basis, the candidate shall be notified of the reason for the zero mark upon release of examination results.

CASE 6: UNIVERSITY of ST. ANDREWS

The University of St. Andrews is a British public research university founded in 1410. Currently, it has a population of over 10, 745 students, 1, 059 academic staff and 1, 480 administrative staff. It is located in St. Andrews, Fife, Scotland, United Kingdom. The university is made up from a variety of institutions, including three constituent colleges — United College, St. Mary's College and St. Leonard's College and 18 academic schools organized into 4 faculties. Students are from over 120 nationalities. The institution was sampled purposefully because one, it is an institution with a long history of existence and two because it offers it has an international presence. The following section highlights the policies that guide examination processes in this university.

Setting of examinations

- Assessment shall be made up of students' abilities in the various modules that they take. It shall take place against published criteria that are appropriate for the work in hand and must reflect what modules and programs at specific levels intend to deliver.
- Standard setting shall not involve relative (norm-referenced) methodology that requires the fitting of marks to predetermined, normally distributed, grade curve such that a fixed proportion of students achieve certain grades.
- For more qualitative works such as essays, the normal standard setting methodology is that every student's work is assessed individually using criterion referenced standards e.g. marking schemes.
- In some disciplines such as Medicine where assessments are likely to vary in difficulty, procedures which take cognizance of the degree of difficulty may be used for instance the Bute Medical School. It ensures consistency of results between different forms of assessment and between different modules and requires that specific levels of competency be shown in order to pass a test.

- External examiners and Deans shall play a critical role in standard setting. They shall play a role in approving examination questions.

Moderation of examinations

- In moderation, a sample of scripts shall be second marked and the moderator either endorses the first marker's evaluation or suggests changes.
- Moderation shall be carried out by suitably qualified members of staff who shall scrutinize a sample of marked work. The moderator shall see samples of work in each assessment banding, including fails, plus any contentious, borderline or undecided marks.
- Following moderation (or second/double marking), a discussion shall take place between the examiner and moderator, which may lead to some adjustment of the original marks.
- Where a module is to be marked by a single member of staff, a significant element of the assessed work must be moderated internally.
- University policy does not require that an External Examiner always reviews examination scripts but he/she shall be invited to moderate a mix up of course work and examinations across the year thought their term in office.

Marking of examinations

- A student's final module grade shall not be awarded on the basis of a single individual's assessment of all elements. In extraordinary cases where this occurs, it shall be communicated to the External Examiner and the relevant Deans.
- In blind double marking, two markers shall attribute a mark and a full set of comments to a script without conferring during the initial marking process.
- In second marking, the second marker shall produce his or her mark and comments having seen the annotations and comments of the first marker.
- Systematic double marking and second marking of all assessed work are not a requirement of the University policy but some Schools may choose to adopt these practices.
- Postgraduate students, inexperienced markers and all members of staff who are new to St. Andrews shall always be supported through second marking or moderation by more experienced colleagues until they are completely familiar with the relevant practices.
- External Examiners shall not act as markers, but shall be asked to routinely review examinations on a rolling schedule. Such a schedule shall ensure that some assessed work from each element of a school's programs is seen by an External Examiner at least once every 3 to 4 years.

V. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive survey methodology. According to Orodho (2009) a descriptive survey design is a method of gathering data from respondents under settings which

have not been controlled or manipulated in any way. This design was suitable for the study since the researcher aimed at gathering data by analyzing policy documents without manipulating any variables by carrying out experiments.

The researcher sampled a total of 6 universities through purposive and simple random sampling techniques. Out of these, three were from the East African region (1 public and 2 private) and the other three were from the United Kingdom (both public). Data collection involved doing a document analysis of policy documents that touch on university examinations. This analysis was based on the study objectives and it mainly focused on

establishing similarities and differences with regard to setting, moderating and marking of examinations in these institutions.

VI. FINDINGS

This section presents the study findings along three main themes: setting, moderating and marking of university examinations. In each of these themes, policy similarities and differences were identified.

Differences observed in policies on setting university examinations

UNIVERSITY	DIFFERENCES IN POLICIES ON SETTING EXAMINATIONS
Uganda Martyrs University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Policy does not specify who is supposed to set examinations.
Manchester Metropolitan University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Policies on setting examinations are developed according to the Quality Assurance Agency's UK Quality Code. ➤ An academic staff member from the department who didn't teach the course being assessed is the one who sets the examination.
University of Eldoret	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Timelines on setting examinations and preparing marking schemes are specified — within the first 4 weeks of the semester. ➤ Examinations in the main university and all collaborating institutions are set by the relevant schools.
St. Johns' University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Two papers are usually set for every course whereby one is randomly selected by the Head of Department to be used for regular examination whereas the other is used for any supplementary or special examination that shall be offered.
University of London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Internal and Intercollegiate Examiners collaborate to set common examinations.
University of St. Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Standard setting doesn't involve norm-referenced methodology that requires performance to assume a normal curve. ➤ In some disciplines such as medicine, procedures which take cognizance of the degree of difficulty may be used e.g. <i>The Bute Medical School</i>.

Table 1: Differences in policies on setting examinations

VII. DISCUSSION

As presented above, there exist a number of differences in policies on setting university examinations. In Uganda Martyrs University for instance, the policy does not specify who is supposed to set examinations. On the other hand, in a university like Manchester Metropolitan, policies on examinations are guided by the Quality Assurance Agency's UK Quality Code — a practice that is not common in universities from the United Kingdom as well as in East Africa. University of Eldoret policies seem to be clearer on timelines for doing various procedures related with setting examinations — something that lacks in other

universities. In Tanzania's St. Johns' University, whenever examinations are set policy requires that two different papers be set whereby one is subsequently used for regular exams and the other used for any special or supplementary exams that may be on offer. Apart from University of London, policies in the other universities do not specify if internal and intercollegiate examiners in any way collaborate when they set common university examinations. The study also established that it was only in University of St. Andrews whereby in some disciplines such as Medicine, procedures which take cognizance of the degree of difficulty are used such as the *Bute Medical School*.

Differences observed in policies on moderating university examinations

UNIVERSITY	DIFFERENCES IN POLICIES ON MODERATING EXAMINATIONS
Uganda Martyrs University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In the absence of external examiners, departments are allowed to develop systems that are coherent with the quality assurance framework approved by university Senate. ➤ The role of moderators is three fold: before examinations are done, during examinations and after examinations are done. Before examinations, they moderate examination questions, the marking scheme, instructions etc. During examinations they are required to be there and provide any necessary assistance to students. After examinations, they check if the marking scheme is being followed by markers and accuracy of tallies.

Manchester Metropolitan University	➤ No major differences noted.
University of Eldoret	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Timelines within which to send copies of moderated papers to the registrar in charge of academics are specified – 5 weeks before the start of regular examinations. ➤ All copies of examination papers except the moderated ones are destroyed by shredding.
St. Johns’ University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Moderation of papers set to be done can take place in the presence of the course lecturer or any other appropriate senior member of staff. ➤ Examination questions and the authorized syllabus are moderated by External Examiners in the second semester of every academic year during moderation of marking. ➤ Examinations set by internal examiners are moderated internally in the second semester of every academic year.
University of London	➤ No major differences noted.
University of St. Andrews	➤ Where a module is to be marked by a single member of staff, a significant portion of the assessed work must be moderated internally.

Table 2: Differences in policies on moderating examinations

Discussion

The study established a number of differences in policies on moderation of examinations. In Uganda Martyrs University, the study found out that the role of moderators extends from the pre-examination period to the post-examination period. Unlike in other universities, policies in the University of Eldoret specify timelines within which various activities on moderation are done.

In St. John’s University, moderation is usually done in the second semester of every academic year. This is not observed in other universities. It was only in St. Andrews that the policy requires that a significant proportion of a student’s work be moderated internally where a module is marked by a single member of staff.

Differences observed in policies on marking university examinations

UNIVERSITY	DIFFERENCES IN POLICIES ON MARKING EXAMINATIONS
Uganda Martyrs University	➤ No major differences noted.
Manchester Metropolitan University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Markers are not supposed to write feedback on scripts especially if it doesn’t help with showing how marking decisions were arrived at. ➤ University policy allows for first, second and even third marking. Second marking is required for assignment tasks which exceed 30 credits whereas third marking is considered when second marking results in significant differences between marks awarded by the two markers.
University of Eldoret	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Timelines within which internal examiners are supposed to submit marks to the Principal Internal Examiner are clearly specified – 6 weeks from the last day of the semester examinations. ➤ Examiners are not allowed to divulge marks to candidates. ➤ Timelines within which Internal Examiners are supposed to mark and submit marks for end of semester examinations are specified – 2 weeks after the end of the examination period. ➤ After release of examinations, a candidate can appeal for remarking within 2 weeks. ➤ A fee of 500 Kenya shillings per paper must be paid by the student before remarking is done.
St. Johns’ University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All tests and other forms of assessment done during the semester are marked before examination week. ➤ Marking of examinations and compilation of results by internal examiners is done in accordance with a time schedule given by the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of academic affairs.
University of London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Every examination script is marked by at least 2 examiners. ➤ Chair of Board of Examiners assigns examiners into pairs for double marking. ➤ Associate examiners are allowed to mark live scripts. ➤ Assistant examiners are appointed to assist in marking scripts where there are large numbers of candidates. ➤ Examiners are required to comply with the Data Protection ACT of 1998 which establishes legal rights for individuals with regard to the processing of their personal data.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Instances of examination irregularities are reported to the Senior Assessment Manager in charge of examinations. ➤ Only candidates' numbers are used to in all examination-related documentation. ➤ Where there are illegible scripts, two different pairs of examiners mark it. In case the second pair is not able to read, a mark of zero is awarded for those parts.
University of St. Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Postgraduate students are allowed to mark examinations provided that they are closely guided by experienced colleagues. ➤ Systematic double marking and second marking are not a requirement of university policy but discretion of respective Schools. ➤ A single examiner cannot mark a candidate's entire work, unless in extra-ordinary cases and with prior communication to the external examiner and the relevant Deans.

Table 3: Differences in policies on marking examinations

Discussion

The study established that unlike in other universities, policies in University of Eldoret give timelines within which various activities associated with marking should be done. In this university also, for a student to be considered for remarking, they must pay a fee of 500 Kenya shillings per paper. However, this was not a policy requirement in the other universities. The University of London is the only university whose policies on marking clearly state what should be done when examination irregularities such as plagiarism, collusion and submission of unauthorized materials occur. Besides this, it was in this institution only that the policy allows two pairs of markers to mark illegible scripts. Moreover, unlike in other institutions,

examination policies allow assistant examiners to be appointed for marking in cases where there is a large candidature in a paper. It was also established that it was only in this university that examiners are required to comply with the UK Data Protection Act of 1998 which establishes legal rights for individuals with regard to the processing of personal data. In university of Manchester, the policy allows for first, second and even third marking. In University of St. Andrews, the policy allows postgraduate students to participate in marking examinations, unlike the case was in other universities. On the same note, in St. Andrews systematic double marking and second marking are not a requirement of university policy but discretion of respective Schools.

Similarities observed in policies on setting university examinations

UNIVERSITY	SIMILARITIES IN POLICIES ON SETTING EXAMINATIONS
Uganda Martyrs University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No major similarities noted.
Manchester Metropolitan University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Examinations are moderated internally by a member of staff who does not directly contribute to that particular assessment. ➤ Examinations are moderated by external examiners before they are administered.
University of Eldoret	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Setting and typing of examinations is done by the course lecturer (internal examiner) who also prepares marking schemes.
St. Johns' University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Examinations are set by a member of academic staff who coordinated/taught the course or by the Head of Department.
University of London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Internal Examiners participate in setting examinations.
University of St. Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For qualitative works such as essays, every student's work is assessed individually using criterion referenced standards e.g. marking schemes. ➤ External examiners and Deans play a critical role in standard setting by approving examination questions.

Table 4: Similarities in policies on setting examinations

Discussion

A number of similarities were noted with regard to setting of university examinations. In almost all institutions, it was established that end of semester examinations are set and typed

by a member of staff who taught that specific course. Setting of other essential documents such as marking schemes was also a common policy requirement.

Similarities observed in policies on moderating university examinations

UNIVERSITY	SIMILARITIES IN POLICIES ON MODERATING EXAMINATIONS
Uganda Martyrs University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is both internal and external moderation of examinations. ➤ Moderators are required to be academically competent in the field they are called upon to moderate. ➤ The primary concern of moderators is to check the accuracy of the examination papers,

	their suitability and relevance for the level for which they are intended to be addressed.
Manchester Metropolitan University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Internal moderation of marking involves a review of a sample of marks and comments on assignment tasks to ensure that marking criteria are fairly, accurately and consistently applied. ➤ Internal moderation is done by employees of the university. ➤ External examiners are not involved in the determination of marks for individual students, but rather provide the program team with an external, independent overview of their marking processes and the fairness and effectiveness of these processes.
University of Eldoret	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Departmental Board of Examiners moderate papers internally before sending them to External Examiners. ➤ Copies of examination papers with marking schemes and course outlines are sent to External Examiners for moderation. ➤ Heads of Departments ensure that comments from External Examiners are discussed and incorporated into the examination papers by Internal Examiners.
St. Johns' University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All examinations are moderated internally. ➤ Final versions of examination questions and authorized syllabuses are moderated by External Examiners.
University of London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ External Examiners take part in moderation of examination scripts.
University of St. Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In moderation, a sample of scripts is second marked and the moderator either endorses the first marker's evaluation or suggests changes. ➤ Internal moderation is done by suitably qualified members of staff. ➤ External Examiners review examination scripts.

Table 5: Similarities in policies on setting examinations

Discussion

Just like in setting, the study established that there were a number of similarities in policies on moderation of examinations. In all universities, policies require that examinations have to be moderated both internally and externally before they are administered. On the same note, policies required that other

related documents such as marking schemes and course syllabuses be moderated before marking commences. In most universities, policies recommend that external examiners should not actually mark examination scripts but rather evaluate the fairness and effectiveness of marking processes.

Similarities observed in policies on marking university examinations

UNIVERSITY	SIMILARITIES IN POLICIES ON MARKING EXAMINATIONS
Uganda Martyrs University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Board of Examiners consisting of internal and external examiners for each program on offer determine whether a candidate has successfully completed or failed an examination on the basis of the set pass mark after marking.
Manchester Metropolitan University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No major similarities noted.
University of Eldoret	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Internal and external examiners take part in marking examinations at the end of every semester.
St. Johns' University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No major similarities noted.
University of London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Associate Examiners (external examiners in other universities) are qualified and experienced colleagues who are not employees of the University and who get appointed to mark examinations in line with university policy. ➤ External Examiners inspect all scripts and other examination-related materials to assess whether marking and classification are of an appropriate standard and consistent.
University of St. Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ External Examiners do not act as markers; their role is to routinely review examinations on a rolling schedule.

Table 6: Similarities in policies on marking

Discussion

A number of similarities were noted in marking of university examinations. In all universities, both internal and external examiners are required by policy to take part in

marking-related activities. External examiners do not actually mark examination scripts but rather provide an independent overview of the fairness and effectiveness of marking processes.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

After a thorough analysis of various policy documents on university examinations, the researcher made a number of observations that subsequently led to the following recommendations:

- i. Universities should clearly state in their examination policies on how cases of examination irregularities such as plagiarism, collusion and impersonation should be handled when detected during marking.
- ii. Universities should formulate new policies to allow for Conveyor Belt System of marking.
- iii. Those universities whose policy frameworks do not clearly give timelines on when various setting, moderation and marking-related activities should take place should adjust their policies to include this.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bloom, B., S. (1994). "Reflections on the Development and Use of the Taxonomy". In Rehg, Kenneth, J; Anderson, Lorin, W; Sosniak, Lauren A. *Bloom's Taxonomy: A Forty-year Retrospective*. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. 93. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education. ISSN 1744 - 7984.
- [2] Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for Language Teacher*. Cambridge: CUP.
- [3] Johnson, K. (2001) *An Introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Longman: London.

- [4] Manchester Metropolitan University (???). Procedures for the Verification, Marking and Moderation of Assessments. Unpublished Manuscript.
- [5] Ogula, P. A., Muchoki, F., M., Dimba, M., and Machyo, C.(2006). *Practical Guide to Teaching Practice for Students and Lecturers*. Catholic University of Eastern Africa: Nairobi.
- [6] Oluoch, E., S. (2014) Challenges Faced by Tutors in Setting Examinations. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5, No. 17 p. 60 – 73.
- [7] Orodho, J. A. (2009). *Elements of Education and Social Science Research Methods*. Maseno: Kanazja Publishers.
- [8] St. John's University of Tanzania (2013). *The General University Examination Regulations for Undergraduate Programs*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- [9] University of St. Andrews Policy on Assessment (2009). *Marking and Standard Setting*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- [10] Uganda Martyrs University (2013) *Quality Assurance Policy*. Directorate of Quality Assurance: Kampala.
- [11] University of London International Academy. (2013). *Guidelines for Examinations 2012 – 2013*.
- [12] University of Eldoret (2014). *Policy Guidelines, Rules and Regulations Governing Admission and Examination of Certificate and Diploma Programs*. University of Eldoret: Eldoret.

AUTHORS

First Author – Edwin Andama Ombasa, Affiliation: College Of Education And Lifelong Learning, Kenyatta University, EMAIL: edwinombasa458@gmail.com, CELL: 0710817426