



ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL ASSESSMENT POLICY AND FRAMEWORK

1. Purpose

This document presents the *Assessment Policy and Framework* of Cyprus Aydın University English Preparatory School. It establishes the philosophy, principles, and operational procedures that underpin all forms of language assessment within the English Preparatory Programme (A1- B1+ levels). The policy ensures that assessment practices are valid, reliable, fair, transparent, and inclusive, reflecting both institutional standards and international benchmarks.

In alignment with the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)* and the *Global Scale of English (GSE)*, this framework aims to:

- ✓ promote consistent and evidence-based evaluation of student performance across all CEFR levels;
- ✓ support learner progress through formative and summative assessment cycles;
- ✓ connect classroom practices with measurable language proficiency outcomes;
- ✓ ensure the integrity and comparability of results throughout the programme.

2. Assessment Principles

All assessment procedures at Cyprus Aydın University English Preparatory School are guided by the following principles:

- **Validity:** Each assessment measures the specific language skills and communicative competences intended at the target CEFR/GSE level.
- **Reliability:** Standardised procedures, double marking, and rater calibration maintain consistent scoring across levels, raters, and tracks.
- **Fairness and Transparency:** Students are informed of assessment criteria, weighting, and grading procedures in advance, ensuring equality of opportunity.
- **Inclusivity:** Assessment practices accommodate individual needs, providing equitable participation for all learners.
- **Alignment with CEFR and GSE:** Test specifications, blueprints, and rubrics are mapped to CEFR descriptors and GSE progression bands to ensure level-appropriate assessment.
- **Academic Integrity:** Honesty and ethical conduct are fundamental to all assessment processes, upholding the credibility of both student achievement and institutional reputation.

3. Types of Assessment

The English Preparatory School integrates both *formative* and *summative* assessments to monitor and enhance student progress throughout the academic year.

The assessment structure remains consistent across A1–B1+ levels, while task complexity and GSE ranges evolve according to learners' proficiency.

- **Placement Test (EPE):** Administered at the beginning of the academic year to determine initial CEFR - GSE aligned proficiency and ensure accurate class placement.
- **Progress Test:** Conducted mid-track to evaluate short-term learning outcomes and provide feedback to both learners and instructors.
- **Level Exam:** A summative end-of-track exam assessing mastery of the learning outcomes at the target CEFR/GSE level.
- **Speaking Exam:** Measures spoken interaction and production through CEFR-GSE aligned communicative tasks.
- **Continuous Assessment:** Includes homework, projects, and assessing consistent engagement and skill application.
- **The Gateway Exam** is a mandatory proficiency test for English Preparatory School students who have completed all tracks. It objectively measures students' overall English skills reading, writing, listening, speaking, grammar, and vocabulary at the end of their preparatory education. The exam accounts for 30% of the Overall Score, which determines eligibility for progression to faculty-level studies.

Together, these components provide balanced and ongoing evidence of receptive, productive, and interactive skill development.

4. Assessment Framework and Weighting

The English Preparatory School consists of four tracks per academic year. Each track integrates continuous and summative components that reflect students' ongoing performance and end-of-track proficiency. The final achievement grade is calculated using the formula below. The same weighting logic applies across all CEFR-GSE levels (A1–B1+), with adjustments to task difficulty, text length, and linguistic range according to GSE bands.

Assessment Component	Sub-Components	Weight within Track (%)	Assessment Focus / Description
Continuous Assessment	Homework, projects,	10%	It reinforces learning and promotes independent study through level-specific assignments or projects.
Progress Test	Reading, listening grammar, vocabulary, sections	30%	Evaluates mid-track learning outcomes.
Level Exam	Reading, listening, writing Grammar, vocabulary sections	50%	Summative evaluation of target CEFR learning outcomes for the track.
Speaking Exam	Interview & discussion tasks (CEFR-GSE aligned)	10%	Assesses oral fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and communicative interaction, task competition.

Track Score Formula:

- $\text{Track Score} = (\text{Continuous Assessment} \times 0.10) + (\text{Progress Test} \times 0.30) + (\text{Level Exam} \times 0.50) + (\text{Speaking Exam} \times 0.10)$

Final Score Calculation:

- $\text{Final Score} = (\text{Track Average} \times 0.70) + (\text{Gateway Exam} \times 0.30)$

Passing Criteria:

- Minimum 65% overall score required to complete the preparatory programme.
- A minimum of 70% attendance per track is mandatory; students who do not meet this requirement must repeat the track.
- For exam dates and administrative details; *(See Exam Procedures and Timetables.)*

5. Assessment Design and Specification

All assessments within the English Preparatory School are designed and implemented in accordance with formally approved Test Specifications and Rubrics. These documents ensure that every assessment accurately measures intended learning outcomes, maintains consistency across levels, and aligns with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the Global Scale of English (GSE). The design process promotes validity, reliability, fairness, and transparency while safeguarding academic integrity and standardization.

5.1. Test Specification Framework

Each Test Specification defines the essential characteristics of an assessment and acts as a blueprint guiding test development, administration, and review.

Every specification document includes the following components:

- **Purpose and Level Definition:** Identifies whether the assessment serves a formative or summative purpose and outlines its CEFR/GSE level target.
- **Skill Coverage and Structure:** Specifies the language skills assessed, item formats, and overall scoring distribution to ensure balanced measurement.
- **Scoring and Marking Guidance:** Establishes the scoring system and references the relevant rubrics used for productive skills.
- **Validity and Reliability Measures:** Summarizes the standardization procedures, moderation, and double marking protocols used to secure consistency.

All assessment materials are prepared, reviewed, and maintained under the supervision of the Testing and Evaluation Unit, ensuring procedural standardization and confidentiality.

5.2. Assessment Design Cycle

The development of each assessment follows a continuous quality cycle designed to ensure fairness and alignment with the institutional curriculum.

1. **Specification Development:** Learning outcomes and CEFR/GSE targets are analyzed to establish the structure and objectives of the assessment.
2. **Item and Task Design:** Test items are written in accordance with course content, cognitive level, and CEFR/GSE descriptors.
3. **Internal Review:** Draft versions are reviewed for clarity, linguistic appropriateness, and content balance.
4. **Moderation and Calibration:** Anchor scripts, standardization meetings, and procedures ensure consistency across raters and administrations.
5. **Administration and Security:** Assessments are delivered under controlled conditions following clearly defined procedures to maintain academic integrity.
6. **Post-Exam Analysis and Review:** Results are reviewed through statistical analysis, rater feedback, and moderation reports to identify items or procedures requiring revision.
7. **Annual Revision:** The Testing and Evaluation Unit updates specifications, rubrics, and procedures annually in consultation with the Quality Assurance and Development Committee (QADC+). While the overall design principles and quality assurance processes remain consistent across the English Preparatory School, each CEFR/GSE level (A1–B1+) has its own approved test. These specifications outline level-appropriate skills, topics, and task types to ensure validity, comparability, and vertical progression throughout the programme.

5.3. Rubrics and Marking Criteria

- Productive skills (Writing and Speaking) are assessed using analytic rubrics that ensure objective, transparent, and consistent marking.
- Each rubric includes clearly defined performance bands across key criteria such as Content, Organization, Language Range, Accuracy, Fluency, and Pronunciation.
- Rubrics are reviewed annually to maintain alignment with CEFR, GSE performance standards and institutional expectations.

5.4. Review and Documentation

- All test specifications, rubrics, and associated procedural documents are subject to an annual review cycle coordinated by the Testing and Evaluation Unit.
- The review process draws data from item analyses, moderation sessions, student feedback, and curriculum updates.
- Revisions are documented through version control and approved by the Quality Assurance and Development Committee (QADC+) prior to implementation.
- This systematic approach ensures the continuous improvement, validity, and reliability of all assessment instruments within the English Preparatory School.

(See Test Specifications and Blueprints (A1–B1+), Writing and Speaking Assessment Rubrics, Exam Procedures.)

6. Marking, Moderation, and Standardization

The English Preparatory School maintains a rigorous and transparent marking and moderation system designed to ensure fairness, reliability, and consistency across all assessments. All procedures are guided by institutional quality insurance plan and procedures aligned with CEFR/GSE standards.

6.1. Marking Procedures

- **Receptive Skills (Reading, Listening, Grammar, Vocabulary):**

These sections are marked objectively using predefined answer keys and standardized marking guides. Ambiguous or faulty items are reviewed during post-exam analysis to preserve fairness and reliability.

- **Productive Skills (Writing and Speaking):**

These components are assessed through analytic rubrics that define CEFR-GSE aligned performance bands across criteria. Writing is evaluated based on sentence structure, spelling and punctuation, creativity, engagement, register and tone, and task relevance. Speaking is assessed through accuracy, grammar and vocabulary use, communicative ability, task completion, and overall performance.

- **Speaking Exams:**

In the Speaking component, one instructor conducts the interview while another independently evaluates the student's performance. This approach allows the interviewer to focus fully on the interaction, while the assessor concentrates on accurate scoring. It ensures a fairer, more transparent, and consistent evaluation process.

- **Writing Tasks:**

Writing tasks are assessed by the lecturer of the Integrated Skills course, who is familiar with the students' overall language development and classroom performance. This ensures contextual understanding, fairness, and alignment between instruction and assessment. The evaluation follows standardized rubrics to maintain reliability and consistency across all levels.

6.2. Moderation and Calibration

- **Pre-Exam Calibration:**

Before each assessment period, Testing and Evaluation Unit participate in calibration meetings to review benchmark samples and ensure shared interpretation of performance criteria. These sessions standardize marking expectations and strengthen inter-rater reliability.

- **During-Exam Moderation:**

Moderators review representative samples of Writing scripts and selected Speaking rubric sheets during and after the marking period. Feedback is provided to raters to ensure uniform application of criteria across all groups and levels.

- **Post-Exam Review:**

After each assessment cycle, moderation summaries and rater feedback are analyzed to identify trends and areas for statistical analyses. Objective exams using optical forms are processed by the Testing and Evaluation Unit together with the responsible lecturers. Subjective exams are graded by lecturers according to rubrics provided by the Testing and Evaluation Unit. All evaluations are completed and announced within seven (7) working days after the exam. When necessary, the Preparatory School may grant an extension. *(See the Moderation Record Template maintained by the Testing and Evaluation Unit.)*

6.3. Rater Training and Professional Development

All lecturers involved in assessment receive regular rater training delivered by the Testing and Evaluation Unit. Training includes familiarization with CEFR/GSE performance descriptors, rubric interpretation, and practice scoring using sample student work. New raters are mentored by experienced examiners until they meet reliability standards. Ongoing professional development ensures consistent quality and shared assessment of literacy across the teaching staff.

6.4. Documentation and Transparency

- **Evidence and Record-Keeping:**

Signed Speaking rubric sheets and Writing scripts are retained as official assessment evidence. All documents include examiner signatures, criterion-based scores, and moderation notes when applicable. These materials are securely stored according to institutional data protection. *(See Data Management Policy and GDPR Compliance Statement.)*

- **Appeal and Review:**

Students may submit a written appeal within the specified time-frame. Appeals are reviewed by an independent lecturer using anonymized copies of the original marking forms or scripts to ensure impartiality and transparency. *(See Exam Review Guidelines)*

6.5. Continuous Quality Assurance

Outcomes from moderation, calibration, and rater feedback are integrated into the annual Assessment Quality Review coordinated by the Testing and Evaluation Unit. This review informs the revision of test specifications, rubrics, and training procedures, ensuring a continuous cycle of improvement and sustained reliability in all assessment practices.

7. Feedback and Reporting

Providing clear and constructive feedback is an essential part of the English Preparatory School assessment philosophy. The purpose of feedback is to support student progress, promote self-awareness, and ensure transparency in how performance is evaluated and communicated.

At the end of each module, a Progress Report is provided to students upon request. **(See *Student Progress Report*)**

7.1. Principles of Feedback

Feedback is formative, learner-centered, and aligned with the principles of validity, reliability, and fairness.

It aims to:

- help learners understand their strengths and areas for improvement;
- link performance directly to CEFR/GSE learning outcomes;
- encourage self-reflection and goal setting; and
- ensure transparency in assessment and grading.

Lecturers are expected to provide students with structured and timely feedback on exams, assignments, and overall performance. Such feedback should be clear, constructive, and specific helping students identify their strengths and areas for development, thereby supporting continuous learning and academic progress.

7.2. Reporting of Results

All assessment results are communicated in a timely, transparent, and secure manner.

- Track results are shared with students through CAU 360 at the end of each assessment period.
- The overall score includes a breakdown of component grades (Continuous Assessment, Progress Test, Level Exam, Speaking Exam).
- Students are informed of their eligibility to progress to the next level or to repeat a track, in line with attendance and performance criteria.
- Assessment records are archived by the Testing and Evaluation Unit and remain accessible for quality assurance and appeals procedures.

7.3. Student Reflection and Support

Students are guided to interpret their feedback constructively through classroom discussions and individual meetings with instructors. Reflection sheets and self-assessment forms are periodically used to promote learner autonomy and awareness of CEFR “can-do” statements. Lecturers monitor student progress across tracks and, when necessary, recommend additional support or remedial activities to address skill-specific gaps.

7.4. Transparency and Accountability

All feedback and reporting practices are monitored by the Testing and Evaluation Unit to ensure consistency and fairness. Regular reviews of feedback samples and grade reports are conducted to confirm that students receive accurate, timely, and supportive information regarding their performance and academic progress.

8. Academic Integrity and Misconduct

Academic integrity is a core value of the English Preparatory School. All assessment procedures are conducted in an atmosphere of honesty, fairness, and respect for academic standards. Any action that compromises against the validity or fairness of an assessment is considered academic misconduct and is subject to disciplinary procedures. *(See Student Disciplinary Regulation)*

8.1. Principles of Academic Integrity

Academic integrity ensures that every student's results genuinely reflect their own ability and performance.

The following principles underpin all assessment practices:

- honesty in the preparation and completion of all assessments;
- respect for institutional regulations and invigilation procedures;
- avoidance of any form of cheating, plagiarism, or misrepresentation;
- confidentiality and responsible use of assessment materials;
- professional conduct of all staff involved in test development and administration.

(See AI Policy, Invigilation Policy)

8.2. Definition of Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to, the following acts:

- using unauthorized materials, devices, or assistance during an exam;
- copying from or communicating with another candidate;
- impersonating or allowing impersonation by another person;
- reproducing, photographing, or sharing exam materials without authorization;
- plagiarism or submission of work not produced by the student;
- use of AI-assisted writing tools or translation software without explicit permission from the instructor;
- altering official scores or attempting to influence assessors' grading decisions.

All forms of misconduct are taken seriously and investigated in accordance with institutional policy.

8.3. Prevention Measures

The institution implements proactive measures to prevent academic dishonesty:

- clear instructions and exam regulations are communicated to students before each assessment;
- all test materials are securely stored and distributed only by authorized staff;
- writing and speaking assessments are designed to promote authentic, task-based performance that limits opportunities for plagiarism or memorization.

8.4. Staff Responsibilities

All academic and administrative staff share responsibility for maintaining assessment of integrity.

Staff are required to:

- model ethical behavior in teaching and assessment;
- ensure confidentiality of exam materials and student results;
- report suspected misconduct promptly and objectively;

9. Academic Integrity

Academic honesty is fundamental to all assessment practices. Plagiarism, cheating, impersonation, or unauthorized assistance during exams or coursework constitutes academic misconduct and leads to disciplinary action. All confirmed cases are documented and reported to the relevant authorities for institutional record-keeping.

10. Special Arrangements

Students requiring assessment support, such as extra time, assistive devices, or separate rooms, must submit valid documentation (e.g., medical or psychological reports) for review by the Testing and Evaluation Unit. Approved arrangements are recorded and applied confidentially to ensure fairness and accessibility.

11. Record Keeping and Data Protection:

11.1. Secure Handling and Storage

- Examination papers, answer sheets, rubrics, and marking forms are securely stored before and after administration, both in physical archives and digital databases.
- Digital copies of assessment records are stored in password-protected institutional systems accessible only to the Testing and Evaluation Unit, Student Affairs Office, and authorized management.
- Physical copies are filed in locked cabinets with restricted access.
- Temporary working materials (drafts, notes, correspondence) are deleted once the quality assurance process is complete, while all official records are retained permanently.

11.2. Long-Term Archiving

All official assessment and student files are preserved as part of each learner's institutional archive for long-term reference, verification, and external review. Archived records may include exam papers, evaluation forms, attendance data, and progress reports. Access to archived materials is limited to authorized personnel and may be granted for official purposes such as audit, accreditation, or student verification.

11.3. Communication of Results

Assessment results are communicated securely through official channels (student portals, institutional email, or printed reports). Results are never shared verbally, via messaging applications, or on unauthorized digital platforms. Staff are required to maintain discretion when handling or displaying student information.

11.4. Staff Responsibility and Compliance

All staff members are regularly reminded of their data protection obligations. Any breach of confidentiality or misuse of information is considered professional misconduct and may result in disciplinary action.

12. Roles and Responsibilities

The English Preparatory School (EPS) operates through a clearly defined organizational structure to ensure consistency, accountability, and quality across all academic and assessment processes. Each unit functions under the supervision of the Academic Director, working collaboratively to maintain alignment with institutional, CEFR, and GSE standards.

12.1 Academic Director

Oversees the implementation of the Assessment Policy and all academic operations of the EPS. Approves major revisions and ensures compliance with university regulations and external quality standards.

12.2 Testing and Evaluation Unit

Designs, develops, and manages all assessments. Responsible for test specifications, rubrics, exam scheduling and administration, moderation, data management, and overall quality assurance. Maintains assessment records and ensures validity, reliability, and transparency across all evaluation processes.

12.3 Curriculum and Syllabus Design Unit

Develops, reviews, and updates syllabus and course frameworks in line with CEFR and GSE outcomes. Ensures curricular consistency across levels and supports lecturers with teaching resources and syllabus alignment.

12.4 CPD (Continuous Professional Development) Unit

Plans and delivers training sessions, workshops, and standardization meetings. Supports professional growth, promotes best practices in teaching and assessment, and coordinates with other EPS units to sustain continuous improvement.

12.5 Curriculum and Syllabus Design Unit

Develops, reviews, and updates the curriculum, syllabus, and learning outcomes in line with CEFR and GSE frameworks. Works closely with the Testing and Evaluation Unit to ensure assessment–curriculum alignment and consistent learning progression.

13. Review of Policy

This Assessment Policy is reviewed annually to ensure ongoing relevance, consistency, and alignment with institutional, CEFR, and GSE standards. The review process is jointly conducted by the Academic Director, Testing and Evaluation Unit, Curriculum and Syllabus Design Unit, and CPD Unit, under the supervision of the GADC.

Revisions are based on:

- outcomes of internal moderation and quality assurance reports,
- feedback from lecturers, students, and coordinators,
- recommendations from external quality audits or accreditation reviews.

All approved updates are documented, approved by the GADC, and communicated to staff prior to the start of each academic year.

14. Marking, Scoring and Deduction Policy

This section defines the institutional principles and procedures governing the marking, scoring, and deduction processes across all assessment components within the English Preparatory School. The aim is to ensure fairness, consistency, and transparency throughout all evaluation stages. All criteria are aligned with CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) and the Global Scale of English (GSE).

14.1. General Scoring Framework

Principle / Practice	Description
Total Score	All exams are graded on a 100-point scale.
Skill Components	Listening, Reading, Writing, and Speaking each weighted according to the approved exam blueprint.
Blueprint	Prepared and approved by the Testing and Evaluation Unit before each exam session.

Score Variation	Question numbers and score allocations may differ between exams depending on task difficulty and coverage.
Scoring Types	Dichotomous: correct = full mark / incorrect = 0 (e.g. MCQ, T/F). Polytomous: partial credit allowed (e.g. Cloze, Short Answer, Writing).

14.2. Skill-Specific Marking Principles

a) Listening and Reading

Question Type	Scoring / Deduction Rule
Multiple-choice	Correct = full mark / Incorrect = 0
True–False (T/F)	Correct = full mark / Incorrect = 0
Short Answer/ Note-Taking	Meaning correct = minor grammar slips ignored
Listening-to-Write	Correct meaning with word form error = –0.25 Partial meaning = –0.5 Wrong / unclear = 0
Paraphrasing	Accepted if meaning is retained.

b) Grammar and Vocabulary

Response Type	Deduction Rule
Fully correct	Full mark
Partially correct structure	–0.5
Fully incorrect	0
Grammatically correct but semantically wrong	–1.0

c) Writing Rubric

(See Writing Rubrics in the Test Specification Document)

d) Speaking Rubric

(See Speaking Rubrics in the Test Specification Document)

14.3. Section-Specific Policies

Section	Policy
Progress Tests	Strict and standardized marking criteria are applied to ensure reliability.
Level Exams	The same strict marking standards are applied, with added focus on holistic language competence.
Homework / Project	–10% per late day (max –30%); referencing errors –2 to –5; plagiarism = 0
Writing & Speaking	Evaluated using official analytic rubrics approved by the Testing and Evaluation Unit

14.4. Sample Scoring Scenarios

Example	Calculation	Result
Cloze	$5 \text{ gaps} \times 1 \text{ pt} \rightarrow 1 + 0.5 + 0 + 1 + (-0.25)$	3.25 / 5
Writing	$5 \text{ criteria} \times 20 \text{ pts} \rightarrow 15 + 15 + 20 + 18 + 17 = 85 / 100$	$16.2 \approx 16$
Speaking	$5 \text{ criteria} \times 20 \text{ pts} \rightarrow 18 + 17 + 15 + 20 + 18 = 88 / 100$	$18 \rightarrow \approx 16$

14.5. Transparency and Quality Assurance

Area	Implementation / Responsibility
Blueprint	Shared before each exam by Testing and Evaluation Unit
Rubrics & Scoring Tables	Shared with staff (detailed)
Deductions	Clearly indicated on marking sheets
Quality Assurance	All results open to moderation and appeal processes

14.6. Error Severity and Score-Based Deduction Framework

Question Type	Sample Score Value	Error Type	Proportional Deduction	Example / Explanation
MCQ / T–F	1 pt	Wrong / blank	–1.0	Dichotomous scoring only
Cloze	1 pt	Minor spelling	–0.25	“envirome nt” for “environm ent”
Cloze	1 pt	Moderate form	–0.5	“talks” instead of “talked”
Cloze	1 pt	Severe	–1.0	“say” instead of “speaks”
Short Answer	5 pts	Minor / Moderate / Severe	–1.25 / –2.5 / –5.0	Deduction scaled to 5 pts
Note-taking	10 pts	Missing / wrong info	–10–50%	Missing facts / incorrect data
Writing	20 pts	Task partially irrelevant	–10%	Some ideas off-topic but meaning preserved
Writing	20 pts	Frequent grammatical / spelling errors	–10%	Reduces clarity and coherence
Speaking	20 pts	Pronunciation / L1 interference	–2–4 pts	Reduces intelligibility
Speaking	20 pts	Incomplete task / broken fluency	–10–20%	Communication not sustained
Listening to Write	10 pts	Wrong meaning	–1 × 10 = –10	Misinterpretation of content

14.7. Moderation and Quality Control

Stage	Responsible Unit	Procedure
Pre-Calibration	CPD & Testing Unit	Rater training with benchmark scripts
Post-Exam Analysis	Testing & Evaluation Unit	Item facility and discrimination analysis
Moderation	Testing Unit	Cross-marking of Speaking & Writing samples
Appeals	Grading and Assessment Data Committee (GADC)	Independent re-marking where necessary

15. Appendices

Appendix 1: Academic Calendar

Appendix 2: Sample Certificate Template (model of official certificate).

APPENDIX-1**ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL 2025-2026 ACADEMIC CALENDER**

ALL LEVELS	
TRACK-1	
EXAM TYPES	DATES
1. Progress Test	24.10.2025
2. Level Exam	21.11.2025
3. Speaking Exam	21.11.2025
TRACK-2	
EXAM TYPES	DATES
1. Progress Test	19.12.2025
2. Level Exam	16.01.2025
3. Speaking Exam	16.01.2025
TRACK-3	
EXAM TYPES	DATES
1. Progress Test	27.02.2025
2. Level Exam	27.03.2025
3. Speaking Exam	27.03.2025
TRACK-4	
EXAM TYPES	DATES
1. Progress Test	24.04.2025
2. Level Exam	22.05.2025
3. Speaking Exam	22.05.2025
END OF THE TRACKS	
EXAM TYPES	DATES
1. GATEAWAY EXAM	25.05.2025

