The Assessor
Single-Artifact Assessment Generation with Validity, Moderation, and Blueprint Discipline

1. **Executive Summary**
   The Assessor generates exactly one assessment artifact per execution:

   • Question Paper
   • Answer Key
   • Marking Rubric
   • Assessment Blueprint

This one-artifact rule is a governance control, not a convenience feature. It keeps assessment design auditable, moderator-friendly, and resistant to leakage where teaching, answers, and evaluation blur into a single document.

2. **The Problem It Solves**
   Typical assessment generation fails in predictable ways:

   • Artifact leakage: questions, answers, and marking logic appear together, increasing misuse and reducing auditability
   • Rubric drift: rubrics become narrative feedback rather than repeatable marking criteria
   • Cognitive demand is described but not enforced: "higher order" becomes a label, not a blueprint constraint

Validity frameworks treat these as threats to construct clarity and to the consequences of score use. [1]

The Assessor targets these failures by enforcing separation, repeatability, and blueprint discipline as non-negotiable output constraints.

3. **Research Foundations**

3.1 Validity and consequences
Assessment quality depends on defensible inferences and predictable consequences of score use. Conflating evaluation with teaching content can distort both interpretation and downstream decisions. The Assessor's separation of artifacts functions as a validity-preserving control by limiting what any single document can reveal or contaminate. [1]

3.2 Cognitive demand is complexity, not difficulty
Cognitive demand frameworks distinguish the complexity of thinking required from perceived difficulty. A hard question is not necessarily a complex one, and a complex question is not necessarily hard in the same way for all learners. The Assessor accepts cognitive-demand parameters and reflects them in item construction and in the assessment blueprint's demand distribution. [2]

3.3 Rubrics must be analytic and repeatable
Rubrics are most defensible when they specify criteria that can be applied consistently

across responses and across markers. The Assessor enforces rubric formatting constraints intended to reduce subjectivity and increase moderation readiness:

- analytic criteria rather than narrative commentary
- bullet-limited criteria lines
- phrase-level marking points suitable for consistent application

This is designed to improve repeatability under moderation. [3]

4. **Constraint Contract**

The Assessor discloses methodology only at an assurance level. It does not disclose prompts, decision rules, thresholds, or implementation details.

The enforced contract is:

- Exactly one artifact per file
- File name appears on the first line
- Artifact-specific prohibitions are enforced

- Question Paper cannot contain answers

- Answer Key cannot contain teaching guidance

- Marking Rubric cannot restate questions or include model answers beyond marking points

- Blueprint must be commentary-free
  - Blueprint includes a cognitive-demand split and item mapping

This creates a simple moderation reality: reviewers validate each artifact independently, and governance controls are visible in the output structure.

5. **NEP and Board Relevance**
   NEP 2020 and PARAKH emphasize competency-based assessment practices, rubrics, and assessment quality processes. The Assessor aligns with that direction by enabling structured artifact generation that is blueprintable, consistent, and auditable. [4][5]

For boards and school leadership, the primary gain is governance: assessment packs become reproducible rather than artisanal, and moderation becomes a process rather than an individual style.

References
[1] Samuel Messick (1995). Validity of psychological assessment: defensible inference and consequences. (User pointer: University of Bath.)
[2] Norman L. Webb (1997). Depth of Knowledge and cognitive demand. (User pointer: ERIC.)
[3] Susan M. Brookhart (2013). Rubrics and repeatable criteria for scoring. (User pointer: UW-Madison Libraries.)
[4] Ministry of Education, Government of India. National Education Policy 2020. (User

pointer: Education Ministry.)

[5] PARAKH competency-based assessment roadmap. (User pointer: Education Ministry.)