

ASSESSMENT POLICY HIGHER EDUCATION

Version:	5 – addition of Maladministration
Policy Originator Role:	Academic Registrar
Equality Impact Assessed:	No
Approved by:	HE Board/ SMT
Date Approved:	27 June 2019
Review Interval:	1 Year
Last Review Date:	Nov 2021
Reviewed by:	H Morgan
Uploaded to intranet (SharePoint) by:	J. Snellock
Date uploaded:	17 Nov 2021
Next Review Date:	May 2022
Audience:	Staff/ Governors/ Delivery Partners

Contents

Contents

1.0	Purpose of the Policy	4
1.1	Scope	4
1.2	Methods of Assessment.....	4
1.3	Return of assessed work.....	4
2.0	Roles and Responsibilities	5
2.1	Academic Registrar.....	5
2.2	Directors	5
2.3	Heads of Department.....	5
2.4	Programme Leader	5
2.5	Internal Verifier	8
2.6	Module tutors	8
3.0	Assessment Procedure.....	10
4.0	Verification of Assessment.....	11
5.0	Feedback	12
6.0	Assessment Scheduling.....	13
6.1	Assessment scheduling	13
6.2	Return of assessed work.....	13
7.0	Unit/Module Failures	15
7.1	Pearson HN Programme 2020/21: Relevant Specifications	15
7.3	Reassessment Guidance	16
7.4	Forms of Reassessment	16
7.5	Repeat Units	16
7.6	Procedure in the event of illness	17
7.7	Late submission of work.....	17
8.0	Access arrangements for learners with learning difficulties or disabilities	19
8.1	Special assessment needs	19
9.0	Assessment/Examination and Resit Boards.....	20
9.1	Assessment/Examination Boards.....	20
9.2	Confidentiality:	20
9.3	Impartiality of Assessment Boards	20
9.4	Scheduling and Frequency of Assessment Boards	20
9.5	Delegated Authority (Chair's Action)	20
9.6	Resit Boards	21
10.0	Progression	22
11.0	Academic appeals process.....	22
12.0	Malpractice by Centre Staff	22
12.1	Maladministration.....	22

13.0	Retaining Records Current students	24
13.1	Certificated students	24
14.0	HE BTEC- Admission with Credit from Prior Learning (which includes RPEL and RPCL).....	25
Annex A:	HE Internal Verification Tools.....	26

1.0 Purpose of the Policy

The main purpose of the policy is to ensure that all students are provided with fit for purpose assessment opportunities during their programme. This policy is also to provide clear guidance to all programme teams about assessment practice.

The assessment policy seeks to ensure that assessment practices and procedures: -

- meet awarding body requirements including, where appropriate, those approved when programmes are validated by an HEI.
- include the appropriate external examiner oversight and scrutiny
- are subject to appropriate internal moderation/verification
- can be evidenced
- are applied consistently across all programme/subject teams
- take account of the diversity of learners

1.1 Scope

This policy and process applies to all Higher Education programmes delivered by the College.

1.2 Methods of Assessment

The specific assessment procedures for qualifications will be in accordance with the requirements of the awarding/validating body including where these are approved at validation by an HEI and as approved by appointed external examiners. Some awards offered by NESOT may not require that students pass all module assessments, in which case these will be described in the assessment strategies of individual programmes of study.

1.3 Return of assessed work

Assessment feedback must be provided to students in sufficient time to enable them to improve their subsequent performance. Feedback will normally be within 20 working days of the final submission date and in all cases as detailed on the assessment schedule and assignment brief.

2.0 Roles and Responsibilities

2.1 Academic Registrar

Responsible for providing staff development on this policy and the roles within it.

2.2 Directors

Responsible for: -

- Ensuring effective moderation of assessment through evaluation and reporting upon implementation, recommending improvements and providing staff development.
- Overseeing the academic management of Departments with HE programme responsibilities, in the context of assessment scheduling and return of assessed work this will include;
- Supporting each Head of Department in their effective management of the implementation of all assessment procedures in programmes in their Department.

2.3 Heads of Department

Responsible for: -

- Ensuring that programme leaders, module/unit leaders, assessors, internal verifiers/moderators and double/second markers undertake their roles.
- Ensuring assessment activity for each programme in their Department is planned, timely and undertaken according to the procedures identified in the associated policies.
- Ensuring the implementation and effectiveness of internal verification/moderation and double marking activity across their Department.
- Monitoring programme teams' adherence to planned assessment schedules when providing feedback to students
- Ensuring the implementation and effectiveness of internal verification/moderation and double marking activity across their Department.
- Heads of Department will be responsible for appointing internal verifiers/moderators and ensuring implementation of internal verification activity across their Department to ensure national standards and awarding body requirements are met.
- Heads of Department, in liaison with programme leaders and module/unit leaders, will ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place to retain coursework submissions securely and will ensure that the return of coursework to learners is timely and secure.

2.4 Programme Leader

Responsible for: -

- Planning programme assessment requirements well in advance of the start of the academic year in which the programme of study takes place. This includes, in liaison with module/unit leaders, internal verifiers/moderators and double markers, responsibility for designing an assessment schedule

which minimises bunching of assessments and reflects due consideration across the programme of:

- assessment structure
- assessment timing
- assessment methodology

Responsibilities specifically related to scheduling assessments in advance of the academic year or semester will include: -

- Reviewing the schedule of assessments across all the modules comprising the programme
- Agreeing dates for moderation of assessment tools and assessment decisions with the programme team.
- Collating information from the programme team about when assessments will be set and the submission dates across modules
- Setting the date by which students can expect to receive their assessment feedback for each assessment.
- Preparing a clear assessment schedule using the Nescot form (found on SharePoint & student handbooks), which includes:
 - i. Module and assignment title
 - ii. Module number
 - iii. Assessor (s)
 - iv. Assessment type
 - v. Date set
 - vi. Submission date
 - vii. Internal verifier/moderator/double marker name
 - viii. Internal verification date
 - ix. Date by which assessed work will be returned to students with feedback
- Ensuring an accurate assessment schedule is provided in programme handbooks distributed at the beginning of the programme of study or academic year as appropriate.
- Accommodating learning support needs for individual students within the assessment schedule by reviewing the schedule, collating information about special support needs any students may have and
 - Where appropriate, provide support and ensure others within the programme team are aware of their responsibilities in providing specific support
 - Advising and supporting individual students in their arrangements with those outside the programme team to ensure additional support to meet the needs of each student is in place
 - Reviewing with the students whether the support is timely and effective in meeting their needs and making further recommendations if appropriate
- Providing clear information about all programme assessment requirements and making these available to all students formally, in programme handbooks and/or module/unit guides at the beginning of the academic year or programme of study. Information will include:-

- how and when assessment takes place including examinations
 - any associated additional costs

 - any special arrangements for assessed coursework, examinations or tests
 - any specialist or alternative ways of assessing/examining learners with learning difficulties/and/or disabilities
 - whether or not previous achievement or experience can count towards the proposed qualification. Where appropriate, copies of learner qualifications will be collected by tutors
 - how to present evidence for holistic assessment
 - rules regarding timescales, examination conditions, methods of communicating the outcomes of assessment etc.
-
- Assessments will be explained to students prior to commencement to ensure they fully understand any requirements and rules, but without compromising the integrity of that assessment.

 - Providing assessment feedback to students within the timescale detailed on the assessment schedule and assignment brief. Unless prohibited by the awarding body the minimum requirements for feedback are
 - A provisional mark or grade
 - Written feedback, explicitly linked to the intended learning outcomes and the assessment criteria, which identifies major strengths and clear recommendations for improvement (if appropriate)

 - Co-ordinating and managing the assessment arrangements for the courses which they lead, in the context of internal moderation/verification this will include facilitating effective internal verification/moderation and/or double marking and presenting a report about the effectiveness of these at assessment boards.

 - Programme leaders and module/unit leaders will hold assessment meetings to agree types of evidence being used to support assessment decisions. The rules of assessment must be applied when making judgements about the evidence or work presented. To be reliable, evidence must be valid (relating to the targeted outcome), authentic (must be the student's own work), current (reflecting current practice) and sufficient (enough to demonstrate competence in the planned outcomes).

2.5 Internal Verifier

Responsible for: -

- Supporting assessors to develop their assessment procedures and facilitate good practice.
- Internal verifiers will monitor assessments by sampling and liaise with assessors to support them in their interpretation of national standards and awarding body requirements.
- It is expected that internal verifiers will provide advice to assessors to assure that assessment tools are fit for purpose, assessment decisions are appropriate and that feedback to students is linked to assessment criteria, promotes improved performance and is timely.
- Internal verifiers in liaison with programme leaders and module/unit leaders, will be responsible for ensuring all assignment briefs or assessments have been subject to a rigorous internal moderation/verification process using the agreed College system prior to distribution to students.

2.6 Module tutors

Responsible for: -

- Programme leaders and module/unit leaders are responsible for formally providing students with information about examinations (date, time, and examination duration) through their assessment plan
- Programme leaders and module/unit leaders are responsible for preparing schemes of work/module guides and making these available to students at the start of their programme.
- Module/unit leaders will hold assessment meetings to agree types of evidence being used to support assessment decisions.(see also programme coordinator responsibilities)

2.7 Assessors¹

Responsible for: -

- Developing appropriate assessment tools, reaching valid assessment decisions, and providing timely feedback to students for the units/modules/elements for which they have responsibility.
- To inform each of these activities assessors will make reference to the programme specifications, awarding body requirements, validated aims, intended learning outcomes and assessment criteria of the unit/module being assessed.
- Reference will also be made to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, Subject Benchmarks, and the Quality Assurance Agency Codes of Practice, particularly Code of Practice 6; Assessment of Students.

2.8 Double markers²

Responsible for: -

¹Sometimes also referred to as the 'first marker'

²Sometimes also referred to as the 'second marker' or moderator

- Assuring the fairness, reliability and consistency of the marking, checking overall standards and ensuring that mark schemes have been applied.
- The reference points (above) which inform assessors will be used by double markers when reaching their judgments.
- Double markers will, for all assessments, meet and formally record their moderation meeting in which the final marks to be awarded are agreed.

3.0 Assessment Procedure

Programme leaders, module/unit leaders and assessors must not give informal extensions to individual students. Any student requiring further consideration due to learning difficulty, learning disability, or circumstances beyond their control, must apply to the programme coordinator formally for an extension in advance of the submission date using the **Authorised Extensions Policy (HE Students)**. Where appropriate any learner unable to meet a submission date must use the Extenuating Circumstances procedures.

It is College policy that a minimum of 30% of summative assessments are double marked except where there are 6 or fewer students in the cohort. In the case of 6 or fewer students ALL summative assessments should be double marked.

In addition, any summative assessments that receive a mark that is or is the equivalent of a First-class honours standard or a Fail should be double marked. All dissertations/theses must be double marked as standard.

Double marking (sometimes referred to as second marking) is the process by which student work is independently assessed by more than one marker. In most circumstances the second marking should be 'blind' i.e. the second marker should not be aware of the name of the student and the first mark. In exceptional circumstances a third marker may be assigned where the first and second marker are unable to agree the mark for an assessment.

4.0 Verification of Assessment

Internal verifiers, in liaison with programme leaders and module/unit leaders, will be responsible for ensuring all assignment briefs or assessments are fit for purpose and have been subject to a rigorous internal moderation/verification process using the agreed College system prior to distribution to students. In addition to any additional requirements prescribed by HEI validating partners, it is necessary that the appointed external examiner signs off the proposed assignment brief or assessment.

Internal verifiers, in liaison with programme leaders, module/unit leaders and assessors, will be responsible for ensuring assessment decisions have been subject to a rigorous internal moderation/verification process in accordance with IV policy, IV handbook and agreed sampling levels, prior to assessment decisions/marks being issued to students.

Internal verifiers/moderators will hold regular standardisation meetings to agree assessment decisions/mark, or types of evidence being used to support the assessment decision. As part of this process Internal Verifiers will support assessors to develop their assessment practice and facilitate good practice

See **Appendix A** for college templates to use for IV/IM of Assessment tools (HE IV/IM1) and Decisions (HE IV/IM2) and HE Assessment Moderation (HE AM1) for HNDs. Programmes which are run by awarding/validating body may use the relevant HEI moderation documentation (can be found in SharePoint).

See also [Assessment Schedules And The Return Of Assessed Work Policy \(He Students\) Policy](#)

5.0 Feedback

Programme leaders, module/unit leaders and assessors will be responsible for ensuring assessment feedback is provided to students in sufficient time to enable them to improve their subsequent performance. In all cases this will be within the College agreed timescale and as detailed on the assignment brief.

Should a module leader or assessor not be able to provide assessment feedback within 20 working days, a form should be completed on SharePoint under the HE Quality section name, "HE Assessment Feedback Staff Extension Form".

Programme leaders, module/unit leaders and assessors will be responsible for ensuring students receive regular updates on their progress through formative and summative assessment feedback.

College policy is that feedback to students on summative assessed work should be in writing and in an accessible format. Appropriate templates for assessment feedback are available on Sharepoint. Supplementary oral feedback to students may also be provided to deepen students' understanding of opportunities to improve their performance. Wherever possible, formal feedback should be provided on formative assessments.

Heads of Department are responsible for monitoring the provision of feedback for programmes in their Department. The minimum requirements for feedback are:

- A provisional mark or grade
- Feedback identifying the major shortcomings and recommendations to enable the work to be improved
- Areas of strength
- Feedback will be explicitly linked to the grading criteria

6.0 Assessment Scheduling

6.1 Assessment scheduling

The coordination of assessment deadlines and reaching effective decisions about the amount and timing of assessment is an essential part of ensuring assessment is fit for purpose. Well planned assessment scheduling enables both staff and students to plan and undertake their workload more effectively. Students need clear information about the timing of individual assessments, how individual assessments relate to each other and their timing in the overall programme of learning. Assessments must be scheduled to, as far as possible, reduce clustering of assessment at particular times of the year and therefore reduce the burden for students and staff. Please also refer to the [Assessment Schedules And The Return Of Assessed Work Policy \(HE Students\)](#) for further guidance in this area.

6.2 Return of assessed work

Students benefit from constructive feedback about their work during the learning process to enable them to improve. Students are more likely to value feedback when it is of use to them, for example, during the module/unit and before their next assessment than at the end of the module.

Assessment feedback must be provided to students in sufficient time to enable them to improve their subsequent performance. Feedback will normally be within 20 working days of the final submission date for summative assessment and in all cases as detailed on the assessment schedule and assignment brief. For formative assessments work there is an expectation that work is returned to students within 1 working week with appropriate developmental feedback provided.

It should be noted that external examiners appointed by validating HEIs should be invited to comment on all draft assessments (coursework briefs and examination papers) that comprise the major elements of assessment associated with a module and contributes to classification. External examiners should be invited to comment by a specified date that allows the timely presentation of examination papers to the Examinations section for processing by a specified date. Draft assessments should be accompanied by model answers (where appropriate) and marking criteria. If no comments are received from the external examiner, the draft assessments (coursework and examinations) will remain unchanged.

Arrangements must also be made for the appointed external examiner to view assignments and an internally moderated sample of student work. The specific administrative and systems arrangements for this will vary depending upon the individual validating HEI/award, for example OU programmes will allow the EE access to the internally moderated sample.

Upon receipt of the external examiner's report it is the responsibility of the programme leader to respond to the report using the appropriate approved template/format and system as determined by the relevant HEI. The programme leader will consult with colleagues from the teaching team. The response to the external examiner's report must be shared with NESOT's Director of Higher Education and Academic Registrar

prior to its submission to the relevant HEI.

Students have the right to view external examiner reports and the response of the programme leader/College. A copy of the report and response should be included in the relevant 'Google Classroom' course area.

7.0 Unit/Module Failures

The regulations of the awarding/validating body will be adhered to where a learner fails to meet the requirements to achieve a pass grade for a unit/module. This is excepting OU programmes where college policy will apply; not all summative assessments have to be passed as long as the overall module mark is above 40%, provided the learning outcomes are met. Please see relevant programme specifications and programme assessment strategy for OU validated programmes for further detail.

Academic compensation may be applicable as determined by the relevant policies of the validating HEI. Please refer to the academic regulations of the relevant university for higher education programmes other than Pearson HNC/D courses. Links to the regulations can be found on the College HE policies webpage.

For the avoidance of doubt, the following policy through to section 7.3 applies only to BTEC awards validated by Pearson and not awards validated by Kingston University, University of Greenwich, University of West London and the Open University.

For full details of the relevant regulations please refer to the [BTEC Centre Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment 2018-19: Levels 4 to 7](#) which can be accessed from this link. It should be noted that different rules apply depending upon whether the Pearson programme is QCF or RQF-based. The following guidelines applies: -

7.1 Pearson HN Programme 2020/21: Relevant Specifications

HN Business	RQF
HN Creative Media (Moving Image)	RQF
HN Creative Media (VFX/Film)	RQF
HN Computing	RQF
HN Sport	RQF
HN Performing Arts	RQF
HN Public Services	RQF

7.2 Assessment Guidance³

The key points regarding resubmissions for RQF HNs have been summarised below, with further guidance on the rules and procedure for each framework detailed below:

- One resubmission is allowed if a student does not achieve a pass on first submission (same assignment).
- The reassessment opportunity will be capped at Pass for that unit.
- A student will not be entitled in any component for which a Pass or higher has already been awarded.

³ [BTEC Higher Nationals Centre Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment](#)

7.3 Reassessment Guidance

A student who, for the first assessment opportunity, has failed to achieve a Pass for that unit specification shall be expected to undertake a reassessment.

- Only one opportunity for reassessment of the unit will be permitted
- Reassessment for course work, project or portfolio-based assessments shall normally involve the reworking of the original activity
- For examinations, reassessment shall involve completion of a new activity
- A student who undertakes a reassessment will have their grade capped at a Pass for that unit
- A student will not be entitled to be reassessed in any component of assessment for which a Pass grade or higher has already been awarded.

7.4 Forms of Reassessment

Retake/Resubmission	Where a student is permitted or required to retake a failed examination at the next sitting or re-submit a failed coursework for a module within the same course year
Repeat	Where a student is permitted or required to repeat all elements of assessment for that module in the following course year
Replace	Where a student is permitted or required to replace a failed module with an alternative and complete all elements of assessment for a module in the following course year

Where on practical grounds it is not feasible to offer the original form of assessment by retake an alternative form of reassessment by re-take may be agreed. This will be designed to ensure that students can demonstrate the learning outcomes broadly associated with the elements of assessment failed at the first attempt.

Where it is not possible to design a reassessment by retake which will allow students to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes associated with particular failed elements, a repeat/replace will be agreed.

7.5 Repeat Units

The following applies to a student who, for the first assessment opportunity and resubmission opportunity, still failed to achieve a Pass for that unit specification:

- At the centre's discretion and Assessment Board, decisions can be permitted to repeat a unit
- The student must study the unit again with full attendance and (if required) payment of the unit fee
- The overall unit grade for a successfully completed repeat unit is capped at a Pass for that unit
- Units can only be repeated once.:

A student who, for the first assessment opportunity within a repeated unit, has failed to achieve a Pass for that unit specification shall be expected to undertake a reassessment. This reassessment will be subject to the standard RQF resubmission rules and regulations as stated above. If a student repeats an RQF

unit and still does not achieve a Pass in neither their first submission nor resubmission, they will be required to either complete a different unit in full or take the unit as compensation. In either instance, the centre must make sure that the relevant rules of combination and requirements have been met. The External Examiner is likely to want to include assessments that have been re-submitted as part of the sample they will review.

7.6 Procedure in the event of illness

Please refer to the Authorised Extensions Policy and Extenuating Circumstances Policy for specific guidance on the procedure in the event of illness.

A claim for mitigating circumstances in relation to an assessment or examination is NOT the same as a request for authorised extension for an assessment deadline. For the purposes of clarity, the following guidance should be used to distinguish between mitigating circumstances and authorised extensions.

- A request for an authorised extension to a deadline would normally be submitted **before** an assessment deadline although there may be specific circumstances where the student may not be able to submit the claim in advance.
- In submitting a request for an authorised extension the student must be clear that they will be able to submit within the proposed extension period which is capped at 10 working days.
- If the student believes that they are unable to submit the work by the proposed amended deadline they should submit a mitigating circumstances claim.

7.7 Late submission of work

The College believes that handing work in on time is a valuable discipline which helps students to develop the ability to plan and organise their time effectively and prepares them for jobs which include a need for time management. In this context the late submission of work is not condoned, unless an authorised extension has been agreed by the Programme Leader⁴ or an extenuating circumstances claim has been upheld.

Programme leaders, module/unit leaders and assessors will be responsible for making students aware, in the programme documentation, of any penalties that they will incur as a result of the late submission of coursework WITHOUT an authorised extension or agreed extenuating circumstance claim. In all cases of late submission the regulations of the awarding/validating body will be followed. In the case of awards validated by the Open University, the penalties listed below will apply.

The penalties for submitting assessments late **WITHOUT** an authorised extension are

⁴ In the case of awards validated by the Open University, extensions for late submission must be notified to the Quality Office

listed below. **Under BTEC regulations⁵ submitted work is assessed ‘without penalty’ in the first instance, the late submission is recorded and the student advised that the lateness of submission may have an impact on their grade.**

Up to 5 working days late	The work will be marked and the ‘without penalty’ grade recorded and capped at pass.
Over 5 working days late	The work will be marked and the ‘without penalty’ grade recorded; that element of assessment will be awarded zero marks.
Late resubmission for a reassessment	The work be marked and the ‘without penalty’ recorded. That element of assessment will be awarded zero marks.

⁵ [BTEC Higher Nationals Centre Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment](#)

8.0 Access arrangements for learners with learning difficulties or disabilities

8.1 Special assessment needs

Students with a disability or requiring special arrangements will be given appropriate and sufficient consideration of their individual needs.

Students are entitled to special access arrangements in all examinations, internal and external, so that they are not at a disadvantage due to a learning difficulty or disability. Examples of access arrangements include extra time, use of a reader, scribe or laptop.

Students are encouraged to inform the college at an early stage if they believe they need access arrangements.

Programme leaders also have a role in identifying students on their programme who require access arrangements. These students are referred to Learning Support in the early stage of the programme so that they can benefit from learning support and so that applications for access arrangements can be made at the appropriate time to the relevant examination board.

Learning Support staff will assess students' access arrangement needs, if this assessment has not been carried out previously, and will inform the programme leader of the arrangements the learner is entitled to.

9.0 Assessment/Examination and Resit Boards

9.1 Assessment/Examination Boards

The purpose of an Assessment Board is to consider and agree students' achievement at the end of each semester.

Assessment/Examination Boards will include the programme coordinator and all those assessing on the units/modules under consideration. The following have rights of membership of the Assessment Board:-

- 9.1.1 Chair (Senior Manager who is independent of the programme)
- 9.1.2 Programme Leader
- 9.1.3 Unit/Module Leaders
- 9.1.4 Members of staff responsible for teaching and assessment of the unit
- 9.1.5 Head of Department
- 9.1.6 Quality Office representative / Academic Registrar
- 9.1.7 Subject External Examiners/Moderator.
- 9.1.8 Representative(s) of the validating HEI 10.1.2

- 9.1.9 Scope and Powers

No body other than an Assessment Board has the authority to recommend to the validating partner the outcome of assessment, the conferment of an award, or to amend the decision of a properly constituted Assessment Board acting within its terms of reference and in accordance with the regulations for the programme of study.

9.2 Confidentiality:

The deliberations of all Assessment Boards are strictly confidential.

All proceedings which relate to individual students are confidential to members of the Assessment Board, the Secretary to the Board, (Academic Registrar or member of the quality office) the Principal, Vice Principal and Deputy Principal, Director of HE and Director of relevant curriculum area.

9.3 Impartiality of Assessment Boards

The deliberations of all Assessment Boards will take place with due regard to the principles of transparency, independence, equity, and impartiality.

Assessment Boards will ensure there is no conflict of interest during proceedings that might compromise these principles.

9.4 Scheduling and Frequency of Assessment Boards

Assessment Boards meet as required, normally on two occasions during an academic year, though where appropriate, more meetings of each Board are permitted

9.5 Delegated Authority (Chair's Action)

A Progression and Award Board may delegate its responsibilities to the respective Chair in relation to recommendations concerning an individual student, or groups of

students, subject to the approval of the relevant external examiner(s).

Delegated responsibility should only be exercised in exceptional cases, for example:

- To correct errors and/or omissions in the assessment marks and/or module results presented to an Assessment Board.

9.6 Resit Boards

The purpose of a Resit Board is to consider and agree learner's achievement in the exceptional cases where the Examination Board has recommended that learners are given a resit opportunity.

All Assessment, Examination and Resit Board meetings will be formally minuted and a record provided to the Quality Office. Immediately after the meeting the programme coordinator will complete and return to the Examinations Office and Quality Office any documentation required by the Examinations Office or Quality Office. In the case of awards validated by the Open University, Assessment Board information about recommended awards are submitted to the Open University's Module Results Approval and Qualifications Classification Panel (MRAQCP). Quorum

The quorum for an Examination Board comprises the Chair of the Examination Board, Academic Registrar or nominee, the representative of the HEI validating the award and at least one member of the Programme team.

10.0 Progression

Criteria for progression into the subsequent year are set out in awarding body regulations which will be communicated to learners at the beginning of the academic year by the programme coordinator. In the case of awards validated by the Open University please refer to Section D of the regulations for validated awards of the Open University⁶.

11.0 Academic appeals process

If a learner is dissatisfied with an assessment decision, s/he should discuss this with the relevant member of staff concerned in the first instance. If this does not lead to a satisfactory resolution, then the learner can appeal formally. The Nescot Academic Appeals Policy is available on the College website (Policies page), HE Student Hub (Google Site) or from the Quality Office. The Academic Appeals Policy of the awarding body will take precedence over the Nescot Policy for learners registered on programmes other than those of Pearson.

12.0 Malpractice by Centre Staff

Any member of staff who is considered to have breached any of the following will be subject to the college's Staff Disciplinary Process.

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered:

- improper assistance to candidates
- inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made
- failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure
- fraudulent claims for certificates
- inappropriate retention of certificates
- assisting students in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves centre staff producing work for the student
- producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own, to be included in a student's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework
- facilitating and allowing impersonation
- misusing the conditions for special student requirements, for example where students are permitted support, such as an amanuensis, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment
- falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud
- fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the student completing all the requirements of assessment.

12.1 Maladministration

Maladministration is any non-deliberate activity, neglect, default or other practice that results

in the College or learner not complying with the specified requirements for delivery of the qualifications as set out in the relevant codes of practice, where applicable. The college has in place policies and procedures to ensure incidents of maladministration do not occur. (Exam Policy, IV Handbook, Disciplinary Policy, Conflict of Interest, Plagiarism, Academic Misconduct, Academic standards and quality)

⁶ <http://www.open.ac.uk/cicp/main/validation/about-ou-validation/regulations-validated-awards>

13.0 Retaining Records Current students

All student work and associated records are retained until after SV or External Verification/Moderation and certification. Work is stored securely and in college.

Stored records include all IV of assignments and unit criteria, tracking of progress etc. Central College systems MUST be used – currently 'ProMonitor'. The College is required to comply with GDPR and approved policies are in place in relation to the retention of student records.

Once certificated, work is returned to students. Arrangements for the collection of work are given to students at the end of the course, this includes the timescales for destroying uncollected work.

13.1 Certificated students

Records relating to summative decisions (to criterion or learning aim level i.e. tracking sheets, assignment briefs, IV records etc.) and of course the Certification claims, are kept for seven years after the completion of the course. This is either electronically or paper, but always secure.

Associated documents

- Academic misconduct policy
- Academic appeals policy
- Extenuating circumstances policy
- Authorised extensions to assessment deadline policy
- Assessment schedules and the return of assessed work Policy HE
- Internal verification policy and handbook
- Learning support policy
- Application Form for RCPL/RPEL
- QAA Quality Codes

14.0 HE BTEC- Admission with Credit from Prior Learning (which includes RPEL and RPCL)

Please also refer to the separate Recognition of Prior Learning policy for more general guidance.

We welcome applications from prospective students who wish to enter at a later stage of a course or gain exemption from specific modules, subject to any specific requirements of an accrediting/regulatory body.


Such entry can be assessed on the basis of existing qualifications (RPCL) and/or experience (RPEL), but the upper limit for this is 50% of the credit required for the award (e.g. typically for a two year HND course, entry to start in the final year) while the minimum exemption considered is 15 credits (i.e. typically one module).


Application is via the normal route and the usual processes for assessing the application apply. In addition, where applicants wish to enter directly to the start of the final year, they should make this clear on the application, citing whether this will be on the basis of existing qualifications and/or experience. All such applications are referred to the Programme Coordinator, who maps general and specific credit from any appropriate existing qualifications against the curriculum from which exemption is sought. In the case of exemption based on experiential learning, the applicant is interviewed by the Programme Coordinator; where an applicant for entry with advance standing is then accepted on the basis of RPEL, our offer is conditional on them preparing a satisfactory portfolio of evidence. We normally charge a fee to assess the portfolio.

Where a prospective student wishes to seek exemption from specific module(s) rather than or in addition to direct entry into a later year, this should be sought, once an offer of a place has been made, via the Admissions team who refer the matter to the above procedure.

It is the student's responsibility to present their evidence in a way that leads an assessor to make a judgement about the validity, authenticity, currency and sufficiency of the evidence.

Annex A: HE Internal Verification Tools

		HE Assessment Moderation			HE AM1
		Qualification title;			
Project/Assessment supervisor name;		Unit/Module title and number;			
Date of moderation meeting;		Project/Assessment title and number;			
First marker name;		Total mark;	Third marker (if appropriate) name;		Total mark;
Second marker name;		Total mark;	Mark allocation by area		
Assessment area		First marker	Second marker	Third marker	Agreed moderated mark
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
Other assessment areas depending upon project					
13					
Total mark					
<p>Please record key areas of debate, and the outcomes of discussion and negotiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p>Resolving differences in double marking Please note: Where differences are relatively large e.g. more than 10%, or where differences span classification boundaries, or for fails, firsts, and borderlines, differences must be resolved through discussion and negotiation between the first and second marker. Where differences cannot be resolved a third marker must be used.</p>					
		First marker signature;			Date;
Confirmation of agreed mark following moderation meeting		Second marker signature;			Date;
		Third marker (if appropriate) signature;			Date;
		Project/assessment supervisor signature;			Date;

		IV/IM of assessment tools		HE IV/IM1
		Qualification title;		
Assessor name;		Unit/Module title and number;		
Internal verifier/moderator name;		Assignment title and number;		
		Please ✓		
Does the design include?		YES	NO	Comments
1	Basic information; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualification title • Unit(s)/module(s) title and number • Assignment title and number • Submission date(s) which is included on the programme schedule 			
2	Learning outcomes of Unit(s)/Module(s) addressed by the assessment			
3	Clear presentation including vocational context and language appropriate to level			
4	Tasks which enable the intended learning outcomes to be demonstrated at an appropriate level			
5	Tasks which facilitate higher level skills development			
6	Clear criteria for assessment			
7	Guidance about how marking/grading will be applied			
8	Guidance about expected evidence for submission, e.g. essay or report, word count, bibliography and references			
9	Equal opportunity for all participants in terms of: age, disability, gender/gender, race, religion, sex/sexual orientation, and pregnancy/maternity.			
10	Suggested reading and resources			
11	Reference to good academic conduct for example referencing, plagiarism and Turnitin (Please note in the comment box if this criteria will be met through electronic assessment submission)			
12	A front sheet which includes authenticity and 'fit to sit' statements and space for confirmatory signatures. (Please note in the comment box if this criteria will be met through electronic assessment submission)			
Actions to complete				
<i>Please circle as/when appropriate</i>				
Please make the above amendments before the assessment/brief is issued to students		IV/IM signature;		Date;
		Assessor signature;		Date;
Amendments completed		IV/IM signature;		Date;
		Assessor signature;		Date;
This assessment/brief is approved for issue to students.		IV/IM signature;		Date;

	Assessor signature;	Date;
--	---------------------	-------

	IV/IM of assessment decisions HE		IV/IM2
	Qualification title;		
Assessor name;	Unit/Module title and number;		
Internal verifier/moderator name;	Assignment title and number;		
Student name;	Assessment method;		
What grade/mark has the assessor awarded?			
		<i>Please √</i>	
Is assessment accurate and appropriate?	YES	NO	Comments/actions to complete
Does the IV/IM agree the assessor grade/mark?			
Does the grade/mark awarded correspond to the assignment guidance about how the marking/grading will be applied?			
Is the feedback linked to relevant learning outcomes and/or assessment criteria?			
Is feedback constructive?			
Does feedback identify opportunities for improved performance?			
Does the feedback include a clear action plan for improvement (HNs only)?			
Actions to complete and guidance to assessor from IV/IM			By when
Assessor comment			
<i>Please circle as/when appropriate</i>			
Please make the amendments identified above before the assessment is returned to the student	IV/IM signature;		Date;
	Assessor signature;		Date;
Amendments completed	IV/IM signature;		Date;
	Assessor signature;		Date;
This assessment is approved and can be issued to the student	IV/IM signature;		Date;