**University Centre
Peterborough**

# UCP-ASS008 Higher Education Assessment Policy for Pearson Edexcel (HNC/D) Programmes

**1.    INTRODUCTION**

1.1    This policy establishes principles, processes, and good practice in all aspects of the management of student assessment for Pearson Edexcel (HNC/D) programmes.

1.2    Assessment is the process by which University Centre Peterborough (UCP) and its partners evidence and evaluate the extent to which a student has met the assessment learning outcomes and acts as a strong formative tool to support and assist student learning and development.

**2.    PURPOSE**

2.1    The aim of this Policy is to ensure the planning and management of assessments is conducted efficiently and in the best interest of students, and that awarding body procedures are always followed.

2.2    This Policy provides a framework for effective, appropriate and fair assessment practice that promotes learning. The purposes of assessment and feedback are to:

- promote deep learning and to engage students;
- assess the extent to which students have achieved learning outcomes;
- assure standards by demonstrating achievement consistent with other Higher Education Institutions [HEIs];
- help students to reflect upon feedback to evaluate and enhance personal performance and development;
- provide a basis for decisions regarding progression and award.

**3.    SCOPE**

2.1    UCP is the higher education arm of the Inspire Education Group (IEG). This Policy covers all higher education provision operating through UCP which includes Peterborough College, Stamford College and franchise partners (Eastern School of Performing Arts and Addict Dance Academy).

2.2    This policy is affective from 31st August 2023 and replaces all other versions. It is to be followed by students registered on Pearson Edexcel HNC/D programmes.

**4.    RELATED DOCUMENTS**

Available from www.ucp.ac.uk/supporting-you/ucp-policies
- UCP-ASS002 Higher Education Security of Summative Assessment Policy
- UCP-ASS004 Higher Education Academic Integrity Policy
- UCP-ASS005 Higher Education Academic Appeal Policy
- UCP-ASS006 Higher Education Extenuating Circumstance Procedure
- UCP-EXM001 Higher Education Examination Policy
- UCP Invigilator Training Guide
- UCP-FIN01 Higher Education Tuition Fee and Refund Policy
Available from https://qualifications.pearson.com/
- BTEC Higher Nationals Centre Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment

BTEC Higher Nationals Centre Guide to External Examination (UK)
Assessment and Verification Tools and templates

## 5.   RESPONSIBILITIES

5.1   **Assistant Principal Quality IEG (Quality Nominee for HE):**
●   Annual review of policy with the UCP Academic Office Manager.

5.2   **The UCP Academic Office:**
●   Maintaining these procedures.
●   Registering students on Edexcel Online (Exams Office)
●   Ensures documents required by the appropriate awarding bodies are held securely in the Google Drives or Canvas, are submitted correctly and on schedule.
●   Arranges for dissemination of externally moderated results and certificates to teaching staff, management, and students.
●   Enabling reporting of assessment results to the Assessment Board.
●   Overseeing decisions on post-results procedures.
●   Liaising with the awarding body.

5.3   **Teaching Staff (Course Leader's and Unit Leaders) are responsible for:**
●   the safe and secure conduct and storage of non-examination assessments.
●   conducting the non-examination assessments in accordance with this policy.
●   production and internal moderation of assessment tasks.
●   identifying access arrangements for students and providing evidence to support requests.
●   ensuring all necessary coursework and/or controlled assessments are completed on time.
●   accurate recording of marks, moderation processes and adherence to deadlines as set by the UCP Academic Office.
●   accurate completion of coursework / controlled assessment mark sheets and declaration sheets.

5.4   **Students are responsible for:**
●   understanding coursework/controlled assessment regulations and signing a declaration that authenticates the coursework as their own.
●   ensuring they conduct themselves according to the awarding body's regulations and the UCP Student Charter.

## 6.   RISK ANALYSIS

6.1.   This policy is required to ensure that correct procedures are in place and are followed.

**Analyse risks of non-adherence to this policy**

6.2.   Failure to adhere to this policy could lead to academic failure of students, complaints, withdrawal of approval by the awarding body and in extreme cases, legal action.

**Staff training needed**

6.3.   All staff involved in the assessment of students are required to undertake regular training delivered by the Academic Office to outline the process to which they need to adhere. This training will be enhanced by regular updates provided on procedural requirements which will be delivered by the Academic Office.

## 7.   DATA PROTECTION

7.1.   UCP complies with the provisions of the General Data Protection Regulation and Data Protection Act, 2018. As such, applications and student data are treated as confidential by all staff involved

in this process and is not divulged unnecessarily or inappropriately. However, the Act requires UCP to release certain information to UK authorities upon request to assist those authorities with the prevention and detection of fraud or other crimes. We will release the requested information on receipt of an appropriate request from UK authorities such as (but not limited to) the police, Home Office (for immigration and related matters), local authorities, and the Department for Work and Pensions. We may use anonymised data collected as part of an individual's assessment and progression for the purpose of fulfilling statistical and reporting requirements.

## 8. PROCEDURE

### PART 1: PRINCIPLES OF ASSESSMENT

8.1. The Unit Leader undertakes a key role in the assessment process. They are responsible for co-ordinating the assessment process.

8.2. Unit Leaders ensure that the delivery of a unit for which they are responsible conforms in all respects with the most up-to-date Pearson course specification.

8.3. The Unit Leader is responsible for coordinating the preparation of assessment tasks. Considerations in unit assessment design include:

- Testing all the unit intended learning outcomes.
- Developing a variety of assessment methods within the relevant courses and to the course learning outcomes.
- Using prescribed (regulatory) assessment volumes (in accordance with the unit credit rating).
- Providing formative assessment opportunities for students.
- Removing opportunities for plagiarism and assessment offences.
- Anonymous marking and moderation procedures (e.g. for student presentations).
- Referring to External Examiners' reports and outcomes of previous student evaluation mechanisms to enhance delivery.

8.4. Assessment tasks for the re-assessment periods (e.g. a further set of essay questions) are set at the same time as the tasks for the main assessment period to ensure comparability and equivalence. Where the assessment task is unique to the student (e.g. a case study, artistic artefact or performance, major project) the same assessment task may be used. In all other cases, a new version of the task is set (e.g. a different set of essay questions).

### 9 Types of Assessment

9.1 UCP uses a range of standard assessment tasks to assess student's unit performance, including (there are other types of assessment task, but those listed below are the most common):

| Practical Assessment | <ul><li>In-Class test</li><li>Lab Test</li><li>Presentation</li></ul> |
|---|---|
| Coursework Assessment | <ul><li>Written assignment, including essay, critical analysis/commentary or evaluation.</li><li>Dissertation/major project</li><li>Report</li><li>Portfolio</li><li>Poster</li><li>Written project</li><li>Case study</li><li>Dissertation</li></ul> |
| Examination | Exams are a method of assessment which is administered by the Exams Office under time constrained conditions. It is |

| | normally timetabled during the published examination weeks. |
|---|---|

9.2 There are the following forms of assessment:
- a) **Formative assessment**, is an integral part of the Higher National assessment process. It is designed to provide students with feedback to enable the student to make improvement to facilitate summative assessment achievement. Feedback should provide students with general advice on how to progress in their studies, but should not tell them what to do. It is good practice to plan for at least one formal opportunity to provide written formative assessment feedback on each assessment. Formative assessment does not count towards the student's final grades.
- b) **Summative assessment**, is the final consideration by the tutor of a student's assignment which provides a measure of a student's achievement in relation to the intended learning outcomes of a programme of study, through formal grading which counts towards the final award. Summative assessment is subject to confirmation by the Award Board.

## 10    Credit

10.1 Each unit of a programme is assigned a credit level by Pearson. All HNC/HND units are usually 15 credits in value, or a multiple of this.

10.2 Units have been designed from a learning time perspective, and are expressed in terms of Total Qualification Time (TQT). TQT is an estimate of the total amount of time that could reasonably be expected to be required for a student to achieve and demonstrate the achievement of the level of attainment necessary for the award of a qualification. TQT includes undertaking each of the activities of Guided Learning, Directed Learning and Invigilated Assessment. Each 15-credit unit approximates to a TQT of 150 hours and 60 hours of Guided Learning

10.3 The assignment of credit to learning should be understood in the following terms:
- Credit is allocated to a learning activity based on its stated learning outcomes.
- A student will only be assigned credit after demonstration through assessment of the achievement of the stated learning outcomes.
- Credit cannot be assigned if no assessment has taken place or if the assessment has not been appropriately conducted.

10.4 The number of credit points assigned is independent of the standards (grades awarded).  Students achieving higher standards will not be allocated more credit points.  The higher standard will be reflected in the grade and classification of the pass.

## 11    Learning Outcomes

11.1 All units and programmes have learning outcomes which explicitly describe the learning central to that study and to which the award of credit and qualifications is linked.

11.2 Unit learning outcomes define a threshold standard of learning which all students who successfully complete the unit are expected to be able to demonstrate.  The learning outcomes will:
- Define a threshold level of learning.
- Be achievable within the notional learning hours or time constraints of the unit.
- Be appropriate to the agreed level of learning.
- Be assessed.

## 12    Scheduling, timing, and volume of assessment

12.1 The scheduling, amount and weighting of assessment types must be appropriate to the level of the award, the programme of study and the delivery mode.

UCP-ASS008 Higher Education HNC-D Assessment Policy
Originator: UCP Academic Officer
Issue: 2 26/05/2023
Approved: Academic Board    Review date:  31 July 2024

Page **4** of **25**

12.2 The amount and timing of assessment should ensure that intended learning outcomes are assessed, and that they enable effective measurement of student achievement. The scheduling of assessment must be such that students have adequate time to reflect on learning before being assessed, and that they can benefit from feedback. Assessment must be designed to minimise plagiarism and encourage academic integrity.

12.3 The assessment task(s) is distributed to students at least four teaching weeks before the task is scheduled to be completed by the students (e.g. The details and specification of a task due to be submitted/completed in Week 10 must be provided to the students no later than week 6). If any assessment task occurs within the first four weeks of the delivery of a unit, the assessment task must be published in the Unit Guide.

12.4 If there is to be a change to the assessment after the brief has been distributed (e.g. as part of a strategy to develop student resilience and readiness for real-world challenges) then the brief should include the date on which details of the change will be released. Students should be aware that a change is imminent, but due to the nature of the challenge they may not be told exactly how their brief will change. Any changes should be in proportion to the size of the overall task, and details should be communicated not less than 4 weeks before the final deadline.

## 13 Qualification Grades

13.1 To achieve a Pass, a student must have satisfied all the Pass criteria for the learning outcomes, showing coverage of the unit content and therefore attainment at Level 4 or 5 of the national framework.

13.2 To achieve a Merit, a student must have satisfied all the Merit criteria (and the Pass criteria) through high performance in each learning outcome.

13.3 To achieve a Distinction, a student must have satisfied all the Distinction criteria (and the Pass and Merit criteria), and these define outstanding performance across the unit as a whole.

## 14 Records of assessment type, components, credits and learning outcomes

14.1 The UCP Academic Office sets up and maintains records of each assessment type by entering approved unit information onto ProMonitor. The following process is adhered to:

- The content of the Pearson subject Specification is transcribed onto ProMonitor by the Academic Office staff for each Unit the Course Leader has identified for delivery. This includes the unit title credit weighting, learning outcomes, assessment elements, assessment type, Unit Leader name.
- Course Leaders are responsible for providing the Academic Office with unit guides, exam papers (first and second sit) and assignment briefs (including resubmission tasks) at least 3 weeks prior to the start of the semester the unit is taught in. All assignment briefs are internally verified before distribution to students.
- The Academic Office checks the information against the approved Unit Specification and enters the assessment due date onto ProMonitor. Students enrolled on the unit are also linked to the unit occurrence on ProPortal.

## PART 2: ASSESSMENT DESIGN

## 15 Internal Moderation of Assessment Design

15.1 All summative assessment (including unit guides, assignment briefs and examination papers), at all levels, must be subject to internal moderation.

15.2 Assessments need to be designed to be robust and to be:
- Valid - assess those skills or attributes that reflect the learning outcomes.

- Reliable - the assessment needs to meet the same results when the same work is assessed by different markers or on different occasions.
- Fair – students need to understand how they are being assessed, what the process is, what criteria are being used and what is expected of them.
- Authentic – consider the knowledge and skills that are relevant in the workplace and that are valued by employers.

15.3 The Unit Leader is responsible for coordinating the preparation of assessment tasks by the deadline set by the Academic Office. This must include:
- Use the BTEC Pearson Assignment brief Template (see Appendix 1).
- Review of assessment design by another member of the course team.
- Creation and review of assessment rubrics.
- Ensure internal verification of assignment briefs is completed and recorded using the BTEC Pearson Internal Verification of Assignment Briefs Template (see Appendix 2).
- Hold standardisation meetings with teaching and marking teams - to create a shared understanding amongst a teaching and marking team of the learning objectives of a subject's assessment tasks and the different standards of student performance in meeting those learning objectives.

15.4 Unit Specifications, Unit Guides, first and second attempt assessment briefs and examination papers must be provided in the secure electronic Academic Office course file (with evidence of internal moderation) by the deadline set by the UCP Academic Office. This file is protected and only accessible to Course Leaders, External Examiners, UCP Academic Office and HE Managers.

## 16    External Moderation of Assessment Design

16.1 The UCP Academic Office tracks External Moderation of assessment design tasks.

16.2 For the Pearson Edexcel the course handbook, unit guide, exam papers and assignment briefs (regardless of level) must be available for external moderation by an External Examiner(s).

16.3 The External Examiner (EE) is required to confirm that:
- There is evidence of appropriate academic standards i.e. the task set.
- Is suitable for the level of the unit.
- The requirements of the task are clear with no ambiguities.
- The task is fair.
- The task or combination of different tasks provides adequate coverage of the unit's intended learning outcomes and content.

16.4 The sample size will depend on; the number of students and units delivered, the number of assessors and the size of the programme team and the level of units in the programmes. Where the number of registrations is:

- 1-8, all students will be included in the sample.

- 9-100, minimum number of individual students sampled will be 9

- 101+, the sample will be an additional 9 students per 100 registrations.

16.5 All students who have had extensions should be made available to the EE. The EE is likely to want to include assessments that have been resubmitted as part of the sample they review.

16.6 The minimum sample will always include no fewer than 3 units reviewed. The sample will always include mandatory core units, and your EE will want to sample different units to those sampled in the previous academic year, unless recommendations or essential actions were previously identified for specific units.

16.7 The EE is invited to access the course file on the google drive. The UCP Academic Office provides access to the EE. The EE then reviews the unit guide and assignment briefs and exam papers and

the Internal Moderation of Assessment Design Form which is kept in Google Drive. The EE completes the External Moderation of Assessment Design Form and saves this in the Google Drive. Once complete they inform the UCP Academic Office.

16.8   The Academic Office tracks responses by the Unit Leader when the EE has made suggestions for revision to the documents. One the EE has approved the tasks the Academic Office informs the Unit Leader who can then publish them to students through CANVAS.


## PART 3: IN-CLASS TEST ASSESSMENT

### 17   In class-tests/ Internally invigilated tests

17.1   Course Leaders are permitted to manage testing (written or online) with the prior agreement of the Exams Officer.

17.2   In such instances, Course Leaders are responsible for ensuring that UCP regulations are met with regard to accommodation, security of materials, training and provision of invigilators, access arrangements and malpractice.

17.3   Students approved for access arrangements must be provided with these arrangements for every test and use of these arrangements recorded and notified to the Exams Office.

17.4   Exams Office staff will carry out ad hoc checks where internally invigilated sessions take place and report findings to the Director of Quality.


## PART 4: COURSEWORK

### 18   Formative Assessment

18.1   Unit guides should give clear instructions on what formative feedback opportunities are available to students. This is designed to provide students with feedback on progress and informs development but do not count towards the students' final grades. Students are encouraged to take up these opportunities as this allows unit tutors to ensure that they have understood how to approach the assessment.

18.2   Tutors should ensure that students have clear instruction concerning what work can be submitted for formative assessment e.g. a practice task, section of final piece of work, essay plan. Formative feedback is not a proof-reading service – it is intended to provide a student with an opportunity to identify some of the key development points that will make an improvement to the assessment approach.

18.3   Students are not able to access additional formative feedback from tutors after their original assessment deadline has passed. This means that students who fail an assessment at the first submission attempt, have extended deadlines, or those reinstated through the extenuating circumstances process, are not entitled to further formative feedback on an assessment task.

18.4   Students should be encouraged to submit draft assessment to Turnitin prior to the assessment due date. There is no limit to the number of times a student can upload a draft to Turnitin PRIOR TO THE MAIN DEADLINE; however, third and subsequent drafts will not return an originality report for 24 hours. Once the main deadline has passed, the most recent document in the Canvas system is taken as the final submission. No subsequent submission is possible.


### 19   Submission of Assessment

19.1   Completed assignments should be submitted through Turnitin via CANVAS unless otherwise specified/agreed. Unit Leaders are responsible for setting up Turnitin and for informing students how to use it.

19.2 Work submitted for a summative assessment component cannot be amended or re-submitted after the submission deadline.

19.3 All coursework assignments and other forms of assessment must be submitted by the deadlines described within the unit guides.

19.4 When submitting evidence for assessment, each student must sign a declaration confirming that the work is their own (see Appendix 3).

19.5 Students should submit their assignments by 2pm on the deadline day. Assignments may be submitted prior to the deadline day, and this is advisable.

19.6 Submission is online through Turnitin®UK. There is a designated page in the Canvas unit for this. To be accepted by Turnitin, the submission must be a single file.

19.7 Graphs and tables in Microsoft Word documents sometimes show up incorrectly in Turnitin. Documents containing graphs and tables must be saved as a PDF file before submitting. Students are responsible for checking the content of files prior to upload, and for checking that the correct file has been uploaded. Pearson specifically exclude the use of text boxes in assessed work. Pearson will consider assignments assessed containing this format as an incorrect assessment decision and the External Examiner will not release certification for a programme if they find use of text boxes within students' work.

19.8 On occasions when a large or practical assessment submission type cannot be accepted through the online Turnitin system students will be informed by the Unit Leader to submit work by email or paper based to UCP Reception (for students studying at Peterborough) and Stamford Library (for students studying at Stamford).

19.9 All paper-based assignments submissions must include a completed assignment front sheet available from the Student Support Centre and electronically from https://www.ucp.ac.uk/supporting-you/ucp-policies/. Cover sheets identify the unit, the assignment and tutor who is to mark it. It is important this is filled out correctly (especially the tutor's name) so that the work is not misfiled in the office.

19.10 Assignments are date and time recorded upon submission. UCP keeps all receipts on file. The student receives a receipt. Students should keep all receipts as proof of submission until they have completed their course. Emails are sent to tutors, listing the work that is ready to be collected for marking, and tutors sign copies of these emails when they collect the work. Coursework will be stored securely by the Unit Leader. See the UCP-ASS002 HE Security of Summative Assessment Policy for details or the process and measures in place.

## 20 Late submission

20.1 Where the first attempt summative assessment is submitted late and there are no accepted extenuating circumstances it will be penalised in line with the following tariff:
- Submission within 5 working days: the grade awarded will be reduced to Pass. Students who submit late will not be awarded any higher level assessment criteria.
- Submission that is late by 6 or more working days: mark as Fail.

20.2 Where the student is submitting assessed work as a reassessment/resubmission and an extension has not been approved, any work submitted after the published deadline will not be marked/graded and the student will be deemed to have failed the assessment concerned.

20.3 Working day in this context means a period of 24 hours or part thereof from Monday to Friday inclusive, excluding public holidays and UCP/College closure days. Site opening dates are published on the UCP website www.ucp.ac.uk/key-dates

## 21 Coursework Summative Feedback to students

21.1    Unit Leaders are responsible for providing students with feedback on assessments within 20 working days of the submission deadline, except for major projects where 30 working days are allowed. If the 20 working day turnaround is not possible, Students should be notified in advance of the expected return date and the reasons for the delay.

21.2    Consistency in the quality of feedback should be delivered by using a standardised approach within course teams that considers areas of good practice and areas for improvement. Consistency in the quality of the feedback given on assessments should be monitored by HE Managers.

21.3    Staff should make it explicit to students, in all contexts (e.g., lecture, practical, seminar, tutorial) whenever any form of 'feedback' is being provided.


## PART 5: EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES

### 22    Short Term Extension Requests

22.1    If there is a valid reason why a student is not able to meet a submission deadline for a piece of assessed work, e.g. sickness, they can request an extension to the submission deadline of up to five, or exceptionally ten working days. They can make an extension request at any time up to 48 hours before the original deadline.

22.2    It is the student responsibility to submit an Extension Request claim through the UCP- UCP-EXT001 Higher Education Extension Request Procedure www.ucp.ac.uk/supporting-you/ucp-policies

### 23    Long Term Extension Request

23.1    Exceptionally, and only in very serious circumstances, it is possible for a student to seek an extension which is over the normal five days. The same process for requesting such an extension applies but the Student Adviser is required to consult the HE Manager. Long-term extensions are designed to help students deal with extreme situations and are only granted in very rare circumstances. As with normal extensions, academic staff are not permitted to agree to long-term extensions.

23.2     It is the student responsibility to submit an Extension Request claim through the UCP- UCP-EXT001 Higher Education Extension Request Procedure www.ucp.ac.uk/supporting-you/ucp-policies

### 24    Extenuating Circumstance Claims

24.1    UCP operates a process called 'Extenuating Circumstances' for each round of assessment that takes place. A student can submit a claim for Extenuating Circumstances with the Student Adviser within 5 working days of an assessment due date if they believe that there are serious sudden and unforeseen circumstances which were beyond your control, e.g. illness, which either:
   a)    prevented you from undertaking an assessment task, e.g. you were unable to attend an examination, give a presentation or submit a coursework assignment; or
   b)    impaired your performance when undertaking an assessment task, e.g. you became ill during an examination.

It is the student responsibility to submit an Extenuating Circumstance claim through the UCP-ASS006 Higher Education Extenuating Circumstance Procedure www.ucp.ac.uk/supporting-you/ucp-policies . UCP is required to schedule an Extenuating Circumstance panel meeting once per month to consider the requests submitted by students.


## PART 6: MARKING, MODERATION AND PUBLICATION OF RESULTS

25      **Marking of Unit Assessments**

25.1    The following principles must be adhered to:
- all items of assessment are subject to anonymous marking wherever possible. In cases where this is not possible double marking is adopted i.e. student presentations.
- the Major Project is subject to unseen double marking.
- all items of assessment (including those for level 4 units) are subject to internal moderation.

25.2    The relevant HE Manager is responsible for identifying adequate numbers of markers and that such staff are properly briefed and trained.

25.3    It is recognised that different disciplines lend themselves to different styles of marking and annotation of student work and examinations. UCP does not set a generic policy on how student work is annotated (e.g. comments written at various places throughout a piece of work, colours of pen used etc.); such approaches are determined at departmental level, usually based on norms in the subject area and the assessment method being used. However, it is a minimal requirement that a summary piece of feedback is provided on all work which relates to the achievement of learning outcomes and refers to the assessment criteria.

25.4    Where an assignment indicates a prescribed word limit, students are advised to work within these parameters. The following items are excluded:
- abstracts;
- data;
- tables;
- figures;
- diagrams;
- in-text references/citations (e.g. "(Baxter 2016: 73-84)")
- footnotes/endnotes used for reference purposes and kept within reasonable limits;
- list of references and/or bibliography;
- appendices.

25.5    Where coursework is submitted late and there are no accepted extenuating circumstances it will be penalised in line with section 20. Marking tutors must not adjust any marks entered onto ProMonitor. The original mark must be entered and the late submission recorded by ticking the assessment element late penalty flag. The late penalty will be applied by the Academic Office.

26      **Marking Standards**

26.1    A piece of written work may be penalised if:
- the handwriting is difficult to read;
- there are multiple crossings out;
- the layout causes an unacceptable degree of confusion;
- misspellings interfere with communication or are the result of consistent carelessness and failure to check adequately work submitted;
- sentence structure is inappropriate to the content and the word order interferes with understanding;
- punctuation causes confusion for the reader as to the perceived meaning of the sentence;
- style is inappropriate to the subject matter (e.g. use of slang terms, excessive formality or informality);
- the text lacks cohesion and coherence.

26.2    Marking Schemes are used at unit level to inform the first marking and internal and external moderation of each item of assessment. Marking schemes identify the knowledge and skills which

students must demonstrate to achieve the learning outcomes of the unit and are used to calculate the total mark to be awarded for an individual item of assessment.

## 27 Anonymous Marking

27.1 Student should put their Student ID (SID) within the header section of documents, not their name. Assessments at all levels are normally marked anonymously by the first marker(s). This means that student work will be identified by SID numbers, not by name. Where anonymity is not possible, assessments are subject to double marking. In such cases, the second marker(s) knows the marks awarded by the first marker(s).

27.2 Since anonymity cannot be maintained, all student presentations are double marked, either by another lecturer attending the presentations or by assessing marks based on recordings.

## 28 Internal verification of assessment decisions

28.1 First markers complete Internal verification of assessment decisions Form (see Appendix 5), attach it to the sample of student work along with the overall mark list and marking scheme, and provide this to the designated internal moderator.

28.2 The first marker selects a sample for internal moderation which:
- Every Assessor
- Every unit
- Work from every assignment
- Every assessment site (for multi-site centres)
- Pass, Merit and Distinction achievement (a student who has not yet achieved or a referred student is also a valid selection).
- takes account of any support required by the HE Manager for new and/or inexperienced first markers.

28.3 Once the internal moderator has agreed the marking standards of the sample provided, they sign the Internal verification of assessment decisions form (see Appendix 5) to confirm this and then forwards the complete bundle to the Unit Leader.

28.4 The internal moderation process should lead to an agreed set of marks. Where agreement cannot be reached, the matter is referred to the HE Manager. The HE Manager can:

- Refer all student work to be second marked (in cases of significant discrepancy between first marker and internal moderator);
- Refer the batch to a third marker who will determine the final mark in consultation with the relevant External Examiner.

28.5 Once the unit marking is confirmed the Unit Leader enters results onto ProMonitor. Course Leaders must audit at least 10% of the marks input on ProMonitor against internal moderation records. The deadline published by the Academic Office must be adhered to.

28.6 Marks entered during the marking and moderation period are hidden from students on ProMonitor. The Academic Office is responsible for restricting students access until results are approved after the Award Board. Provisional marks (i.e. those that have been internally moderated but not yet ratified by an Award Board) which are disclosed to a student, should clearly state that the marks are not confirmed and could change. Assessments must go through the moderation process prior to any release of confirmed marks (see Appendix 4).

28.7 Marks are entered and codes applied in ProMonitor to record late submissions, academic offence penalties or non-submission of an assessment element. These outcomes will be confirmed to students on ProMonitor following the Award Board meeting.

## 29 External Moderation of Scripts

29.1 External examination usually takes place through an annual visit, although additional visits may be put in place. The EE will agree a date for the remote visit with the Academic Office and Course Leader during the Spring term.

29.2 Course Leaders will provide external moderation sample packs of coursework to the Academic Office by the internal deadline agreed in the secure electronic Academic Office course file (with evidence of internal moderation). This file is protected and only accessible to Course Leaders, EEs, UCP Academic Office and HE Managers.

29.3 The external moderation sample includes:
- a full schedule of all marks achieved by all students registered for the unit, clearly indicating which examples of work have been included in the sample;
- the relevant Unit Specification;
- the Assessment Criteria and Marking Standards/marking scheme for each assessment task;
- The Internal Moderation Form;
- Sample size as requested by the EE;
- the assessed work covering the full range of marks identified within the final marksheet (covering borderlines, pass, fails and distinctions);
- includes The EE is likely to want to include assessments that have been resubmitted;
- work submitted by any IEG staff member studying on the programme;
- covers all markers;
- addresses any external requirements such as those of Professional Statutory Regulatory Bodies.

29.4 Assessments scripts which have not been externally moderated will be securely stored by the Course Leader until the date the awarding bodies have notified it can be released.

29.5 An EE can request a second sample if the first sample did not result in a release of certification or if further sampling is required in order for certification to be released. Any second sample will include:
- The elements of the first sample that prevented the release of certification, including all additional work completed by students to address any gaps identified
- Evidence that amendments have been made to address the issues highlighted in the EE report, such as revised grades for the whole cohort foe the unit(s) affected
- Work for additional students so that the EE can check that standards are being reapplied consistently across a programme.

29.6 The Award Board cannot agree to moderate the marks of individual candidates unless the EE has moderated all assessed work for all candidates.

29.7 Course Leaders are expected to discuss with Unit Tutors feedback on assessment provided by the EE at the Award Board and in the annual EE Report.

## 30 Retention of student evidence and assessment records

30.1 Course leaders should retain:
- both internal and external assessment records for centre and awarding body scrutiny for a minimum of three years following certification
- all student work for a minimum of 12 weeks after certification has taken place. In certain cases, it may be more feasible to retain photographic evidence of three-dimensional pieces of work rather than retaining the work itself.

## 31 Academic Misconduct

31.1 UCP will fully investigate all cases of suspected assessment offences. Any assessment suspected of contacting an academic offence must be referred though the process outlined in the UCP-ASS004 Higher Education Academic Misconduct Policy www.ucp.ac.uk/supporting-you/ucp-polices.

31.2 If an EE finds evidence of plagiarism that has not been detected by UCP they will set the centres status on Edexcel Online to Certification Pending – Centre Action Required.

32 **Award Boards**

Principles

32.1 Every programme of study leading to an award must have an Award Board.

32.2 Award Boards consider the academic progress of individual students. The performance of unit assessment and teaching is discussed.

32.3 UCP aims to publish the date for all formal meetings 12 calendar months in advance.

32.4 Members are responsible for ensuring that appropriate academic standards are set for all assessed work for units/units within their remit (including consideration of mean marks, standard deviation, and comparisons with student achievement in previous years and/or assessment periods).

32.5 The responsibility of the Award Board is to:
   a) Review of formal presentation of unit mark sheets.
   b) Ensure that assessment and feedback is purposeful and supports the learning process.
   c) Consider the appropriateness of mark ranges in the context of anticipated or normative mark standards and to moderate where appropriate.
   d) Consider and approve unit/unit results and the award of the associated credit to determine for a student who has failed a unit/unit at the first attempt the form and timing of re-assessment on the following basis.
   Either:
      i. The form of re-assessment is normally a resit of the failed elements. Exceptionally, an alternative method of re-assessment is provided e.g. where the original method of assessment can no longer be repeated for an individual student.
   or
      ii. The re-assessment is undertaken after further attendance (where deemed necessary in view of the subject area e.g. laboratory work for a science-based subject).
   e) Identify those units/unit for which incomplete marks have been submitted for referral to the Panel for action, where appropriate.
   f) Receive reports from the Pre-Student Review Panel (which considers the following)
      i. Extenuating Circumstance Panel
      ii. Academic Misconduct Panel
      iii. Academic Appeals Information (pertinent to the board)
   g) Confirmation and Recommendations for Progression.


Preparation – Data and Documentation

32.6 The Academic Office publishes the deadline for all internally moderated marks to be entered on to ProMonitor. This is the Monday of week 16 and week 33 and week 43 for resits of the Academic Office calendar. After this date, results on Promonitor are closed to staff for editing.

32.7 The Academic Office staff export the marksheet report from ProMonitor. This is done from the Promonitor reporting screen and provides the Panel with performance data by unit.

Post meeting

32.8 The Academic Office keeps a formal record of the attendance at, discussions held, and decisions made at the meeting. Decisions regarding student achievement must be recorded accurately in the minutes of the meeting.

32.9 Following an Award Board all decisions and any mark amendments are updated on ProMonitor by the Academic Office staff.

32.10 Draft Award Board minutes are produced within 5 working days of each meeting and sent to members and the Academic Office.

32.11 Award Board minutes must be confirmed and approved at each subsequent meeting.

32.12 Where a decision is being deferred the reason must be fully minuted.

32.13 Deferred decisions must be resolved within 30 working days of the date of the Award Board. A decision must be made based on the information available at that time.

Communication of decisions to Students

32.14 Unit marks and progression decisions will be published by the Academic Office and made available for students to view after the meeting of the Award Board, at by the date set by Academic Office.

32.15 Students are informed if they have failed a summative assessment submission on Promonitor. If eligible, they are informed of the deadline date a second submission is due on Promonitor. Assessment tasks are posted on Canvas by the Unit Leader. It is the student's responsibility to check their assessment results and reading published guidance.

## PART 8 UNIT RESULTS AND PROGRESSION DECISIONS

### 33 **Failure of a unit**

33.1 If a student has failed to satisfy the minimum pass criteria for each learning outcome of the assignment, they will be awarded a fail overall for the unit. There are two possible outcomes of this.

33.2 **1- A reassessment opportunity:** A student who, for the *first* assessment summative submission opportunity, has failed to achieve a Pass for that unit shall be expected to undertake a reassessment. The student must have submitted assessment by the initial deadlines set in the assignment brief, met an agreed deadline extension, or has submitted work late that has been accepted.

- 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.
- The resubmission must be undertaken by the student with no further guidance.
- The original evidence submitted for the assessment can remain valid and be extended, or may need to be replaced partially or in full.
- Students must resubmit work within 15 working days of being notified that a resubmission has been authorised. Arrangements for resubmitting the assessment should be conducted in such a way that does not adversely affect other assessments and does not give the student an unfair advantage over others. Resubmission of the

assignment may be conducted under supervised conditions, even if this was not necessary for the original assessment. For example, this may be necessary to ensure that plagiarism cannot take place.

33.3 Reassessments and resits must not be actioned by Course Leaders or teaching staff until they have been approved by the Award Board. The Award Board will specify which elements of assessment the learner is required to resubmit and the date by which the work has to be submitted. Marks already obtained for elements of assessment which the learner is not required to resubmit will be carried forward unless the Award Board specifies otherwise.

33.4 **2- Retake a unit:** Where a learner undertakes a reassessment but still fails to achieve a Pass for the unit, they may be permitted to retake the unit, subject to Examination Board approval. In these instances, the student will be required to repeat the unit. When repeating a unit:

- The student must enrol and study the unit again with full attendance and payment of the unit fee;
- The overall grade for a successfully completed repeat unit is capped at a Pass for that unit;
- Units can only be repeated once. If a student repeats a unit and still does not Pass in neither their first submission not resubmission, they will be required to either complete a different unit in full or take the unit as compensation.
- Any evidence previously produced by the student for a unit being repeated that did not meet the Pass criteria remains valid and may be used for assignments within the repeat unit.

33.5 A denial of a retake opportunity due to disciplinary reasons can be applied by Award Boards (for example, where students have received disciplinary warnings, where they have not met attendance requirements or where they have failed to submit assessments).

33.6 Deadlines for reassessments and retakes must be set and clearly communicated to learners and published on ProMonitor. Course Leaders must inform learners of the rules regarding resubmissions and ensure that learners are familiar with the UCP-ASS005 Higher Education Academic Appeal Policy available from www.ucp.ac.uk/supporting-you/ucp-policies .

## 34    Conditions for progression

34.1 The Award Board makes a formal annual progression decision for all students. A student progresses from one level or year of study to the next of the course for which they are registered, provided they continue to enrol for the units selected from within the prescribed set of core, specialist and optional units for their course, satisfy any prerequisites or other academic requirements for unit enrolment and meet the requirements for progression set out in this section.

34.2 In order to progress from one level or year of study to the next, a student who has failed unit(s) must;

- Be in a position to recover any failure.
- Not have failed a unit more than once (and after resubmission attempts are exhausted).

## 35    Discontinuation of studies

35.1 An Award Board is authorised to terminate a student's studies for the following reasons;

- The student has exhausted the total number of attempts as set out in section 33.
- Major academic irregularities see UCP-ASS004 Higher Education Academic Integrity Policy available from www.ucp.ac.uk/supporting-you/ucp-policies

35.2 A student is discontinued when it is no longer possible to continue to study towards the intended award (e.g. the student has failed re-take units or does not meet the progression criteria above). Students concerned about their progress should discuss this with their personal tutor and also use the extenuating circumstances process outlined above. It should be noted that in order to pass the qualification, students are required to achieve ALL units.

## 36 Compensation provisions for the HNC

36.1 Students can still be awarded an HNC if they have attempted but not achieved a Pass in one of the 15 credit units completed, but have completed and passed the remaining units.

36.2 Where a learner has met the agreed minimum requirement for progression from HNC, but still has some assessments outstanding (for example, because of Mitigating Circumstances or failure to submit by the deadline), the student would normally be expected to complete those reassessments before the start of the next academic year. Where this is not possible, a learner may be allowed to progress onto HND Level 5, provided that the outstanding work is resubmitted by the deadline specified by the Award Board. A formal decision about progression will be confirmed by the Award Board.

## 37 Compensation provisions for HND

37.1 Students can still be awarded an HND if they have attempted but not achieved a Pass in one of the 15 credit units completed at Level 4 and similarly if they have attempted but not achieved one of the 15 credit units at Level 5. However, they must complete and pass the remaining units for an HNC or HND as per the unit rules of combination of the required qualification.

## 38 Calculation of the overall qualification grade

38.1 To achieve a Pearson BTEC Higher National Certificate qualification a student must have:
- Completed units equivalent to 120 credits at level 4;
- Achieved at least a pass in 105 credits at level 4.

38.2 To achieve a Pearson BTEC Higher National Diploma qualification a student must have:
- Completed units equivalent to 120 credits at level 5;
- Achieved at least a pass in 105 credits at level 5;
- Completed units equivalent to 120 credits at level 4;
- Achieved at least a pass in 105 credits at level 4.

38.3 The overall qualification grade for the HND will be calculated based on student performance in Level 5 units only.

38.4 All units in valid combination must have been attempted for each qualification. The conditions of award and the compensation provisions will apply as outlined above. All 120 credits count in calculating the grade (at each level, as applicable).

| | Points per credit | | | Point boundaries |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pass | 4 | | Pass | 420-599 |
| Merit | 6 | | Merit | 600-839 |
| Distinction | 9 | | Distinction | 840 + |

# Assignment Brief
# Unit number: unit-title

Pearson | BTEC

| | |
|---|---|
| Student Name/ID Number | |
| **Unit Number and Title** | **# Title** |
| Academic Year | |
| Unit Tutor | |
| **Assignment Title** | **Title** |
| Issue Date | |
| Submission Date | |

**Submission Format**

**Unit Learning Outcomes**

**Transferable skills and competencies developed**

**Vocational scenario**

**Assignment activity and guidance**

UCP-ASS008 Higher Education HNC-D Assessment Policy
Originator: UCP Academic Officer
Issue: 2 26/05/2023
Approved: Academic Board   Review date:  31 July 2024

Page **17** of **25**

| Recommended Resources |
|---|
| **Please note that the resources listed are examples for you to use as a starting point in your research – the list is not definitive.** |
| |

## Learning Outcomes and Assessment Criteria

| Pass | Merit | Distinction |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Pass | Merit | Distinction |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

# Internal Verification of Assignment Briefs
# BTEC Higher Nationals (RQF)

**PEARSON | BTEC**

| INTERNAL VERIFICATION – ASSIGNMENT BRIEF | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Programme title** | | | |
| **Assessor** | | **Internal Verifier** | |
| **Unit** | | | |
| **Assignment title** | | | |

| Is this assignment an authorised assignment brief published by Pearson? | Y/N |
|---|---|

| If yes, has it been amended by the centre in any way? Please give details. |
|---|
| |

| INTERNAL VERIFIER CHECKLIST | | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Is the qualification title, unit title and unit number accurate? | Y/N* | |
| Is the submission date achievable in relation to the issue date of the assignment? | Y/N* | |
| Is the vocational scenario appropriate, sufficient and current? | Y/N* | |
| Does the assignment cover all unit assessment criteria? If not, which LOs/AC are being assessed? | Y/N* | |
| Are the types of evidence required for the assignment appropriate? <br> a) For pass criteria <br> b) For higher grading criteria | Y/N* | |
| Are the types of evidence required for the assignment appropriate? <br> c) For pass criteria <br> d) For higher grading criteria | Y/N* | |
| Comment on the appropriateness of the assignment guidance for the level of the unit | | |
| **Overall, is the assignment fit for purpose?** | Y/N* | |

UCP-ASS008 Higher Education HNC-D Assessment Policy
Originator: UCP Academic Officer
Issue: 2 26/05/2023
Approved: Academic Board    Review date:  31 July 2024

Page **19** of **25**

| | |
|---|---|
| Identify any essential actions for change to the assignment | |
| Summarise any good practice that you identify in the assignment | |

*If the Internal Verifier recommends remedial action before the brief is issued, the Assessor and the Internal Verifier should confirm that the action has been undertaken below.

| **Assessor signature** | | **Date** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Internal Verifier signature** | | **Date** | |

**Action required:**

|  |
|---|
|  |

**Action taken:**

|  |
|---|
|  |

| **Assessor signature** | | **Date** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Internal Verifier signature** | | **Date** | |

*ONCE INTERNALLY MODERATED AND UNIT LEADER HAS COMPLETED ACTIONS REQUIRED PLEASE SAVE IN YOUR COURSE FILE IN THE ACADEMIC OFFICE SECURE MS TEAMS DRIVE (OR FORWARD TO ACADEMICOFFICE@UCP.AC.UK)*

*A copy of this form will be sent to the External Examiner to confirm moderation and where appropriate, implementation of suggested changes has taken place.*

UCP-ASS008 Higher Education HNC-D Assessment Policy
Originator: UCP Academic Officer
Issue: 2 26/05/2023
Approved: Academic Board    Review date:  31 July 2024

Page **20** of **25**

# Student Assessment Submission and Declaration

PEARSON | BTEC

When submitting evidence for assessment, each student must sign a declaration confirming that the work is their own.

| Student name: | | Assessor name: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Issue date: | Submission date: | | Submitted on: |
| Programme: | | | |
| Unit: | | | |
| Assignment number and title: | | | |

## Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a particular form of cheating. Plagiarism must be avoided at all costs and students who break the rules, however innocently, may be penalised. It is your responsibility to ensure that you understand correct referencing practices. As a university level student, you are expected to use appropriate references throughout and keep carefully detailed notes of all your sources of materials for material you have used in your work, including any material downloaded from the Internet. Please consult the relevant unit lecturer or your course tutor if you need any further advice.

## Student Declaration

**Student declaration**

I certify that the assignment submission is entirely my own work and I fully understand the consequences of plagiarism. I understand that making a false declaration is a form of malpractice.

Student signature:                                    Date:

**APPENDIX 4: Flowchart of UCP's Marking Processes**

**Marking Stage**

Student submits work / sits examination →

Work collated and passed to Unit Leader

↓

Work is marked by Unit Leader and Unit Tutor(s)[1]. All marks collated by Module Leader for ALL groups. [2]

**Internal Moderation Stage**

↓

Internal moderation samples selected. Moderation undertaken by a second academic[3]

↓

Any issues? — YES →

NO ↓

Unconfirmed marks and feedback to students within 20 working days (30 working days for Major Projects) → Students receive initial (unconfirmed) feedback

**External Moderation Stage**

↓

External moderation samples selected and moderated by External Examiners[4]

↓

Any issues? — YES →

NO ↓

**Student Review Stage**

Academic Office runs Progression decision report and shares with Student Review Panel

The following is reviewed per student:
- Compensation
- Late submission cap
- Academic Offences
- Extenuating Circumstances

↓

Marks and progression decisions forwarded to Exams Board

UCP-ASS008 Higher Education HNC-D Assessment Policy
Originator: UCP Academic Officer
Issue: 2 26/05/2023
Approved: Academic Board    Review date: 31 July 2024

Page **22** of **25**

**Award Board Stage**

- Marks submitted to Exams Board for consideration and approval
- Marks Approved by Award Board and forwarded to Awards Board
- Confirmed marks issued to students via online record.

All work is marked anonymously or double marked where identity of the student is known (e.g. in a presentation)

The internal (and external) moderation process compares work from all groups where the module is delivered more than once

The sample for the internal moderation process comprises a minimum of eight pieces of work or 10% (whichever is the greater) for each marker and covers the full range of marks

Modules at levels 4, 5, 6 and 7 are subject to external moderation.  The sample for the external moderation process comprises a minimum of eight pieces of work or 10% (whichever is the greater) for the entire module and covers the full range of marks

UCP-ASS008 Higher Education HNC-D Assessment Policy
Originator: UCP Academic Officer
Issue: 2 26/05/2023
Approved: Academic Board    Review date:  31 July 2024

Page **23** of **25**

# Internal verification of assessment decisions – BTEC Higher Nationals (RQF)

**PEARSON | BTEC**

| INTERNAL VERIFICATION – ASSESSMENT DECISIONS (Multiple students) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Programme Title:** | | | | | |
| **Unit Number and Title:** | | | | | |
| **Assessor Name:** | | | **Internal Verifier Name:** | | |
| **Assignment title:** | | | | | |
| **Name of Student** (If a larger sample is required please add rows or use additional sheets) | **Submission Type** (First, Resubmission, Retake) | **Grade the Assessor has awarded.** | **Assessment Decision Accurate (Y/N)** (Resubmission and Retake must be capped at a Pass) | **List the learning outcomes and assessment criteria where inaccurate decisions have been made** | **State why the assessment decision is inaccurate.** *If an inaccurate decision is recorded the Internal Verifier must recommend actions detailing the issues to be addressed. The Assessor and the Internal Verifier must then confirm that the action has been undertaken before assessment decisions are issued to learners.* |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

UCP-ASS008 Higher Education HNC-D Assessment Policy
Originator: UCP Academic Officer
Issue: 2 26/05/2023
Approved: Academic Board    Review date:  31 July 2024

Page **1** of **25**

| INTERNAL VERIFIER CHECKLIST | Y/N |
|---|---|
| **Has every student and the Assessor confirmed the authenticity of the evidence?** | |
| **Is there evidence of collusion or plagiarism?** | |
| **Is the assessor feedback to the student appropriate and constructive to each student?**<br>● Points out strengths and areas for improvement.<br>● Linked to relevant learning outcomes and assessment criteria.<br>● Clear as to why the student did not achieve higher grades.<br>Identify opportunities for improved performance in future assignments. | |
| **GENERAL COMMENTS** | |
| | |

| Any actions required must be reviewed across the whole cohort. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Action Required** | **Target Date for Completion** | **Date Action Completed** |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| **I confirm that the assessment decisions are accurate, there is no evidence of assessment malpractice and any action points have been addressed and completed in respect of the whole cohort.** | | |
| **Internal Verifier signature** | **Date** | |
| **Assessor signature** | **Date** | |