

Software Testing 2025-6 Guidance for Auditors

This is a brief guide for auditors. The main determinant of the mark should be a realistic evaluation of the portfolio determined by the self-evaluation. The role of the auditor is to check that the self-evaluation and the portfolio sections are consistent. You should take account of the following:

- Students will often under-grade their work and this is just as common as overgrading so be as watchful for inconsistencies in both directions.
- This is an honours/MSc class so much of what we are auditing will be sound. If a student awards a grade in the range 0-2 please check there is some significant deficiency that merits the award of such a grade.
- If the student has successfully passed the quiz for a learning outcome their grade on any sub-criterion for that LO cannot be less than 2.
- The students have only 50 or so hours of work on this coursework so please take this into account in your auditing. It will not be possible for students to carry through everything they plan to do or recognise as being necessary. So, by “thorough” in the guidance you should interpret this as “demonstrate a thorough understanding”.
- A score of 5 is exceptional and any section being evaluated at this level should be inspected carefully to see that it meets the criterion. This will probably require you to inspect the relevant part of the student’s repo.
- A self-evaluation with a very high population of 4s is claiming to demonstrate thorough achievement of the learning outcomes. For those learning outcomes with three or four marks of 4 you should consider whether you think there are any significant omissions and consider regrading.
- A self-evaluation with a very high population of marks in the range 0-2 means the student is claiming not to have a good grasp of the learning outcomes. For those learning outcomes with three or four marks of 2 or less you should consider whether you think there is evidence in the portfolio of sound understanding and consider regrading. It may be worthwhile referring such cases to the Course Organiser for further investigation
- Any regrading should be justified with a brief comment indicating why you are making this adjustment.
- **The portfolio should make specific, detailed, reference to material in the repo. Beware vague, generic, superficially well-written portfolios that may entirely be the product of generative machine learning. This is not a total ban; judicious use of such tools can improve the readability of portfolios. You will have the opportunity to probe this in the meeting to agree grades.**