

**Policy No.  
UCP-ASS001**



University Centre  
**Peterborough**  
Part of the Inspire Education Group

# **Higher Education (Non-examination) Assessment Handbook for Open University Provision**

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Assessment equivalence .....	4
2.1. Major Project/Dissertation .....	5
2.2. Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) Requirements .....	5
3. Scheduling, timing, and volume of assessment .....	6
3.1. Components of assessment .....	6
4. Marking Standards .....	6
4.1. Marking of Module Assessments .....	6
4.2. Anonymous Marking .....	7
4.3. Marking grid .....	9
4.4. Formative Assessment .....	20
4.5. Summative Assessment and submission information .....	20
4.6. Coursework Summative Feedback to students .....	21
4.7. Late submission .....	21
4.8. Extensions and Extenuating Circumstances .....	21
4.9. Credit .....	21
4.10. Learning Outcomes .....	22
4.11. Assessment Qualify Marks .....	22
4.12. In class-tests/ Internally invigilated tests .....	22
4.13. Records of assessment type, components, credits and learning outcomes .....	22
5. Moderation .....	23
5.1. Internal Moderation of Assessment Design .....	23
5.2. External Moderation of Assessment Design .....	23
5.3. Marking Moderation and Publication of Results .....	24
5.3.1 Internal Moderation .....	24
5.3.2 External Moderation of Scripts .....	25
6. Archiving of Students' Assessed Work .....	26
7. Academic Misconduct .....	26
8. Examination Boards .....	26
8.1. Principles .....	26
8.2. Attendees .....	27
8.3. Agenda .....	28
8.4. Preparation – Data and Documentation .....	28
8.5. Post meeting .....	29

8.6.	Communication of decisions to Students .....	29
8.7.	Results Process.....	29
9.	Module and Component Assessment Scores .....	30
10.	Degree Classifications .....	30
11.	Certificates .....	30
	APPENDIX 1 .....	32
	APPENDIX 2 .....	37
	APPENDIX 3 .....	39

## 1. Introduction

At University Centre Peterborough, we believe that high-quality assessment is fundamental to effective learning and student success. The Module Leader plays a central role in managing the assessment process, ensuring that every module is delivered in line with approved guidelines and that all assessment tasks align with the intended learning outcomes. Assessments are carefully designed to reflect course requirements, using a range of methods and lengths appropriate to the credit value of each module. They are regularly improved based on feedback from External Examiners and student evaluations and structured to support academic integrity, using anonymous marking and moderation wherever possible, and always seeking to minimise opportunities for plagiarism and cheating.

All assessment tasks, including those for resits or retakes, are developed at the same time as main assessments to ensure fairness and consistency. While unique tasks, such as personal projects or performances, may be repeated where appropriate, most resits will require students to complete a new assignment rather than simply resubmit previous work. Course Leaders oversee this process, ensuring that Module Leaders adhere to assessment principles and that all tasks are approved by External Examiners and that the data is accurate in ProMonitor.

As the use of artificial intelligence grows within education, our assessment strategies are continually reviewed to stay relevant and effective. Our approach encourages critical thinking, research, responsible use of technology, and academic honesty, preparing students for both academic progression and real-world challenges. Assessments are designed to foster deep reflection, problem-solving, and the development of workplace-ready skills, while maintaining consistency, reliability, fairness, inclusivity, and validity in line with Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) expectations.

UCP is committed to making assessment fair and accessible for all students. Reasonable adjustments are provided through Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) to ensure everyone can demonstrate their achievements. These adjustments are carefully matched to course outcomes, maintaining both relevance and fairness. Ultimately, our assessments aim to support the development of skills such as problem-solving, communication, and adaptability, which are valued in further study and employment.

## 2. Assessment equivalence

*Implemented for all provision validated during and post 2024-25.*

Following a national norm that a third of all study hours allocated to a module are assigned to assessment. Based on a linear approach of 1,000 words per 5 credits and 10 hours of study per 10 credits.

Assessment Type	15 credits	30 credits	60 credits	Notes
<b>Academic Poster (with feedback/video)</b>	A3 (class)	A2 (external audience)	–	
<b>Artefact + Log Book</b>	Varies by artefact size			
<b>Case Study + Reflection</b>	L4: 2,000–2,500 words	L4: 4,000–5,000 words	12,000 words	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>L5 &amp; 6: 3,000 words (15cr) 6,000 words (30cr)</li> <li>L5 &amp; 6: 12,000 words (60cr)</li> </ul>
<b>Digital Artefact</b>	10 minutes	20 minutes		
<b>Discussion/Seminar + Reflection (min 500 words, L5+)</b>	10 mins per person	20 mins per person		
<b>Essay Pack – Plan, Research Review, Reflection</b>	L4: 2,000–2,500 words	L4: 4,000–5,000 words	12,000 words	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>L5 &amp; 6: 3,000 words (15cr) 6,000 words (30cr)</li> <li>L5 &amp; 6: 12,000 words (60cr)</li> </ul>
<b>Exam</b>	90–120 minutes	120–180 minutes		
<b>In-class Test</b>	60–90 minutes	120–180 minutes		
<b>Journal + Reflection (min 500–1,000 words)</b>	3,000 words	6,000 words*	12,000 words	
<b>Observation and Documentation</b>	45 total minutes	60 total minutes		
<b>Testimonial</b>				
<b>Portfolio + Reflection (min 500–1,000 words)</b>	3,000 words equivalent	6,000 words equivalent*	12,000 words equivalent	
<b>Practical</b>	60–90 total minutes	120–180 total minutes		
<b>Presentation + Q&amp;A (500 words eqv.)</b>	15 mins per person	30 mins per person		

<b>Report</b>	L4: 2,000–2,500 words	L4: 4,000–5,000 words	12,000 words	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>L5 &amp; 6: 3,000 words (15cr) 6,000 words (30cr)</li> <li>L5 &amp; 6: 12,000 words (60cr)</li> </ul>
<b>Simulations – Timed Live Brief</b>	1 working day	2 working days		
<b>Viva (L5+)</b>	30 minutes	60 minutes		

### Key/Notes:

L4 = Level 4; L5 = Level 5; L6 = Level 6

Asterisk (\*) denotes higher or cumulative word counts.

Where two entries are given (e.g. L5 & 6), use the higher standard if at a higher level or for larger credit volume.

'Equivalent' refers to a mix of written, practical, and reflective evidence.

'–' means not applicable or not usually used at that credit size.

Variance	30 credits	60 credits
<b>Major Projects Assignment(s)/UMP + reflection (1000 words min)</b>	Maximum of 8,000 words eqv.	12,000 words eqv. (max 16,000)
<b>EPA – determined by standard</b>		
<b>BA Counselling</b>		
<b>Modular study for in-service courses (e.g. Education)</b>	1 assessment	
<b>PSRB (e.g. Engineering IET)</b>		

### 2.1. Major Project/Dissertation

May have higher word counts (up to 16,000) and combine multiple assessment types (e.g., written report, presentation, viva).

### 2.2. Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) Requirements

Where professional bodies require specific assessments (e.g., engineering standards), these are stated in module documentation.

### Reassessment Tasks

Usually set at the same time as the main assessment to ensure parity.

### **3. Scheduling, timing, and volume of assessment**

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.

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.

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 module, the assessment task must be published in the Module Guide.

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.

#### **3.1. Components of assessment**

Each module contains at least one, and no more than three, assessment elements.

Every element is directly mapped to one or more of the module's intended learning outcomes, as specified in the Module Specification, and enables students to demonstrate achievement of those outcomes. Assessment elements are identified sequentially (e.g., 010, 011, 012).

### **4. Marking Standards**

#### **4.1. Marking of Module Assessments**

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 modules) are subject to internal moderation

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

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.

Where an assignment indicates a prescribed word limit, students are advised to work within these parameters. If a student writes 10% above or below the specified word count the tutor can deduct up to 5% from their assessment result. In determining the text to be included within the maximum word limit, 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.

Where coursework is submitted late and there are no accepted extenuating circumstances it will be penalised in line with the Regulations for the validated award of the Open University. 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 percentage will be applied by the system.

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.

Marking Schemes are used at module 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 module and are used to calculate the total mark to be awarded for an individual item of assessment.

## **4.2. Anonymous Marking**

Student should put their 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).

Since anonymity cannot be maintained, all student presentations contributing 25% or more of a module’s assessment are double marked, either by another lecturer attending the presentations or by assessing marks based on recordings.



### 4.3. Marking grid

Mark Band	Knowledge & Understanding	Cognitive Skills	Practical & Professional Skills	Key Transferable Skills
<b>Level 4</b>				
90-100%	Exceptional information base exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with extraordinary originality	Exceptional management of learning resources, complemented by assured self-direction/exploration and exceptional team working skills. Exceptional structure/accurate expression. Demonstrates intellectual originality and imagination	Exceptional academic and intellectual skills. Exceptional practical/professional skills. Exceptional problem-solving skills. Exceptional ability to evaluate the appropriateness of the information	Exceptional ability to use specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. Exceptional ability to reflect on own strengths, limitations and performance
80-89%	Outstanding information base exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with clear originality	Outstanding management of learning resources, complemented by assured self-direction/exploration and outstanding team working skills. An exemplar of structured/accurate expression. Demonstrates intellectual originality and imagination	Outstanding academic and intellectual team/practical/professional skills. Outstanding problem-solving skills. Outstanding ability to evaluate the appropriateness of the information	Outstanding ability to use specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. Outstanding ability to reflect on own strengths, limitations and performance
70-79%	Excellent information base, exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues	Excellent management of learning resources, complemented by self-direction/exploration and excellent teamworking skills. Structured/accurate expression	Excellent academic/intellectual and team/practical/professional skills. Very good problem-solving skills. Very good ability to evaluate the appropriateness of the information	Excellent ability to use specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. Very good ability to reflect on own strengths, limitations and performance

	with considerable originality			
60-69%	Good information base; explores and analyses the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with some originality	Good management of learning resources with some self-direction and good teamwork skills. Structured and mainly accurate expression.	Good academic/intellectual skills and team/practical/professional skills. Good problem-solving skills. Good ability to evaluate the appropriateness of the information	Good ability to use specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. Good ability to reflect on own strengths, limitations and performance
50-59%	Satisfactory information base that begins to explore and analyse the discipline and its ethical issues but is still mainly imitative	Satisfactory use of learning resources and input to teamwork. Some lack of structure/accuracy in expression	Acceptable academic/intellectual skills and satisfactory practical/professional skills. Acceptable problem-solving skills. Acceptable ability to evaluate the appropriateness of the information	Acceptable ability to use specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. Acceptable ability to reflect on own strengths, limitations and performance
40-49%	Basic information base; omissions in the understanding of major/ethical issues. Largely imitative	Basic use of learning resources with limited self-direction and limited teamwork skills. Some difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression	Some difficulties with academic/intellectual skills and developing practical/professional skills. Some difficulties with problem-solving. Some difficulties in evaluating the appropriateness of the information	Some difficulties using specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. Some difficulty reflecting on their strengths, limitations and performance
30-39%	Limited information base; limited understanding of the discipline and its ethical dimension	Limited use of learning resources. No self-direction, little input to teamwork and difficulty with structure/accuracy in expression	Weak academic/intellectual skills. Practical/professional skills are not yet secure. Little evidence of problem-solving abilities. Little evidence of the ability to evaluate information	Weak ability to use specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. Weak ability to reflect on own strengths, limitations and performance

UCP-ASS001 Higher Education (Non-examination) Assessment Handbook

Originator: UCP Academic Office Manager

Version 1

Approved: December 2025

Review date: December 2027

20-29%	Little evidence of an information base. Little evidence of understanding of the discipline and its ethical dimension	Little evidence of the use of learning resources. No self-direction, with little evidence of contribution to teamwork	Very weak academic/intellectual skills and significant difficulties with structure/expression. Little evidence of practical/professional skills. Very weak problem-solving skills. Very weak ability to evaluate information	Very weak ability to use specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. Very weak ability to reflect on own strengths, limitations and performance
10-19%	Inadequate information base. Inadequate understanding of the discipline and its ethical dimension	Inadequate use of learning resources. No attempt at self-direction with an inadequate contribution to teamwork	Very weak academic/intellectual skills and major difficulty with structure/expression. Inadequate practical/professional skills. No evidence of problem-solving abilities. No evidence of the ability to evaluate information	Insufficient ability to use specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. Insufficient ability to reflect on own strengths, limitations and performance
1-9%	No evidence of any information base. No understanding of the discipline and its ethical dimension	No evidence of the use of learning resources of understanding of self-direction with no evidence of contribution to teamwork	No evidence of academic/intellectual skills and incoherent structure/expression. No evidence of practical/professional skills. No evidence of problem-solving skills. No evidence of the ability to evaluate information	No evidence of the ability to use specified IT applications and strategies for given purposes and tasks. No evidence of the ability to reflect on own strengths, limitations and performance
0%	Awarded for: i. non-submission; ii. Dangerous practice; iii. Fails to address			

	the assignment brief and/or related learning outcomes			
<b>Mark Band</b>	<b>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</b>	<b>Cognitive Skills</b>	<b>Practical &amp; Professional Skills</b>	<b>Key Transferable Skills</b>
<b>Level 5</b>				
90-100%	Exceptional information base exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with extraordinary originality and autonomy. With some additional effort, work may be considered for internal publication	Exceptional management of learning resources, with a higher degree of autonomy/exploration that clearly exceeds the brief. Exceptional team working skills. Exceptional structure/accurate expression. Demonstrates intellectual originality and imagination	Exceptional team/practical/professional skills. Exceptional ability to explain/evaluate information/data. Work may be considered for internal publication	Exceptional ability to use specified IT applications and strategies, as appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Exceptional ability to reflect on and evaluate own strengths, limitations and performance and identify the impact of them in relation to knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
80-89%	Outstanding information base exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with clear originality and autonomy	Outstanding management of learning resources, with a degree of autonomy/exploration that clearly exceeds the brief. Outstanding team working skills. An exemplar of structured/accurate expression. Demonstrates intellectual originality and imagination	Outstanding team/practical/professional skills. Outstanding problem-solving ability and ability to evaluate approaches. Outstanding ability to explain/evaluate information/data	Outstanding ability to use specified IT applications and strategies, as appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Outstanding ability to reflect on and evaluate own strengths, limitations and performance and recognise the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability

UCP-ASS001 Higher Education (Non-examination) Assessment Handbook

Originator: UCP Academic Office Manager

Version 1

Approved: December 2025

Review date: December 2027

70-79%	Excellent knowledge base, exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with considerable originality and autonomy	Excellent management of learning resources, with a degree of autonomy/exploration that may exceed the brief. Excellent team working skills and structured/accurate expression	Excellent academic/intellectual skills and team/practical/professional skills and ability to evaluate approaches. Very good ability to explain/evaluate information/data	Excellent ability to use specified IT applications and strategies, as appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Very good ability to reflect on and evaluate own strengths, limitations and performance and recognise the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
60-69%	Good knowledge base; explores and analyses the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with some originality, detail and autonomy	Good management of learning with consistent self-direction. Good team working skills. Structured and mainly accurate expression	Good academic/intellectual skills and team/practical/professional skills and ability to evaluate approaches. Good ability to explain/evaluate information/data	Good ability to use specified IT applications and strategies, as appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Good ability to reflect on and evaluate own strengths, limitations and performance and recognise the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
50-59%	A satisfactory knowledge base that begins to explore and analyse the theory and ethical issues of the discipline	Satisfactory use of learning resources. Acceptable structure/accuracy in expression. Satisfactory teamworking skills. Acceptable level of academic/intellectual skills, going beyond description at times.	Satisfactory team/practical/professional skills. Inconsistent self-direction. Weak evidence of ability to evaluate approaches. Weak evidence of ability to explain/evaluate information/data	Satisfactory ability to use specified IT applications and strategies, as appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Satisfactory ability to reflect on and evaluate own strengths, limitations and performance and recognise the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
40-49%	Basic knowledge base with some	Basic use of learning resources with little self-direction. Some input to	Some difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression but	Some difficulty using specified IT applications and strategies, as

UCP-ASS001 Higher Education (Non-examination) Assessment Handbook

Originator: UCP Academic Office Manager

Version 1

Approved: December 2025

Review date: December 2027

	omissions and/or lack of theory of discipline and its ethical dimension	teamwork. Some difficulties with academic/intellectual skills. Largely imitative and descriptive	developing practical/professional skills. Insufficient evidence of ability to evaluate approaches. Insufficient evidence of ability to explain/evaluate information/data	appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Some difficulty reflecting on and evaluating own strengths, limitations and performance and recognising the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
30-39%	Limited knowledge base; limited understanding of the discipline and its ethical dimension	Limited use of learning resources, working towards self-direction. Limited teamworking skills. General difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression. Weak academic/intellectual skills. Still mainly imitative and descriptive	Team/practical/professional skills that are not yet secure. Little evidence of the ability to evaluate approaches. Little evidence of the ability to explain/evaluate information/data	Insecure IT skills for using applications and strategies for various purposes and tasks. Little evidence of the ability to reflect on and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and recognise the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
20-29%	Little evidence of an information base. Little evidence of understanding of the discipline and its ethical dimension	Little evidence of the use of learning resources. No self-direction, with little evidence of contribution to teamwork. Very weak academic/intellectual skills and significant difficulties with structure/expression. Very imitative and descriptive	Little evidence of practical/professional skills. Scant evidence of ability to evaluate approaches. Scant evidence of ability to explain/evaluate information/data	Little evidence of the ability to use specified IT applications and strategies, as appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Scant evidence of ability to reflect on and evaluate own strengths, limitations and performance and recognise the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
10-19%	Inadequate information base. Inadequate understanding of the	Inadequate use of learning resources. No attempt at self-direction with an inadequate contribution to teamwork. Very weak academic/intellectual skills and	Inadequate practical/professional skills. Inadequate ability to evaluate approaches. Inadequate evidence of ability to	Inadequate ability to use specified IT applications and strategies, as appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Inadequate ability to reflect on and evaluate own

	discipline and its ethical dimension	major difficulty with structure/expression. Wholly imitative and descriptive	explain/evaluate information/data	strengths, limitations and performance and recognise the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
1-9%	No evidence of any information base. No understanding of the discipline and its ethical dimension	No evidence of the use of learning resources of understanding of self-direction with no evidence of contribution to teamwork. No evidence of academic/intellectual skills and incoherent structure/expression	No evidence of practical/professional skills. No evidence of the ability to evaluate approaches. No evidence of the ability to explain/evaluate information/data	No evidence of the ability to use specified IT applications and strategies, as appropriate for various purposes and tasks. No evidence of the ability to reflect on and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and recognise the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
0%	Awarded for: (i) non-submission; (ii) dangerous practice; (iii) failing to address the assignment brief and/or related learning outcomes			
<b>Mark Band</b>	<b>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</b>	<b>Cognitive Skills</b>	<b>Practical &amp; Professional Skills</b>	<b>Key Transferable Skills</b>
<b>Level 6</b>				

UCP-ASS001 Higher Education (Non-examination) Assessment Handbook

Originator: UCP Academic Office Manager

Version 1

Approved: December 2025

Review date: December 2027

90-100%	Exceptional information base exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with extraordinary originality and autonomy. Work may be considered for publication within the University Centre or beyond	Exceptional management of learning resources, with a higher degree of autonomy/exploration that clearly exceeds the assessment brief. Exceptional team working skills. Exceptional structure/accurate expression. Demonstrates intellectual originality and imagination	Exceptional team/practical/professional skills. Work may be considered for publication. Exceptional ability to evaluate sources and data	Exceptional ability to select, use and evaluate IT applications and strategies which are appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Exceptional ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
80-89%	Outstanding information base exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with clear originality and autonomy	Outstanding management of learning resources, with a degree of autonomy/exploration that clearly exceeds the assessment brief. Outstanding team working skills. An exemplar of structured/accurate expression. Demonstrates intellectual originality and imagination	Outstanding team/practical/professional skills. Outstanding ability to evaluate sources and data	Outstanding ability to select, use and evaluate IT applications and strategies which are appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Outstanding ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
70-79%	An excellent knowledge base that supports analysis, evaluation and problem-solving in theory/practice/ethics of discipline with	Excellent management of learning resources, with a degree of autonomy/research that may exceed the assessment brief. Excellent team working skills and structured and creative expression	Excellent academic/intellectual skills and practical/team/professional/problem-solving skills. Very good ability to evaluate sources and data	Excellent ability to select, use and evaluate IT applications and strategies which are appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Very good ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning

	considerable originality			methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
60-69%	A good knowledge base that supports analysis, evaluation and problem-solving in theory/practice/ethics of discipline with some originality	Good management of learning resources, with consistent self-directed research. Good team working skills and structured and accurate expression	Good academic/intellectual skills and team/practical/professional/problem-solving skills. Good ability to evaluate sources and data	Good ability to select, use and evaluate IT applications and strategies which are appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Good ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, Values/beliefs/ethics/employability
50-59%	A satisfactory knowledge base that supports some analysis, evaluation and problem-solving in theory/practice/ethics of discipline	Satisfactory management of learning resources. Some autonomy in research but inconsistent. Satisfactory teamworking skills and structured and mainly accurate expression	Acceptable level of academic/intellectual skills going beyond description at times. Satisfactory team/practical/professional/problem-solving skills. Acceptable ability to evaluate sources and data	Acceptable ability to select, use and evaluate IT applications and strategies which are appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Acceptable ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
40-49%	Basic knowledge base with some omissions at the level of theoretical/ethical issues. Restricted ability to discuss theory and/or solve	Basic use of learning resources with little autonomy. Some difficulties with academic/intellectual skills. Some difficulty with structure/accuracy in expression, but evidence of developing team/practical/professional/problem-solving skills	Basic practical/professional/problem-solving skills. Limited ability to evaluate sources/data	Basic ability to select, use and evaluate IT applications and strategies which are appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Limited ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning

	problems in the discipline			methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
30-39%	Limited knowledge base. Limited understanding of discipline/ethical issues. Difficulty with theory and problem-solving in discipline	Limited use of learning resources. Unable to work autonomously. Little input to teams. Weak academic/intellectual skills. Still mainly descriptive. General difficulty with structure/accuracy in expression	Practical/Professional/problem-solving skills that are not yet secure. Insufficient ability to evaluate sources/data	Insecure IT skills for selecting, using and evaluating IT applications and strategies appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Little evidence of their ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
20-29%	Little evidence of a knowledge base. Little evidence of understanding of discipline/ethical issues. A significant difficulty with theory and problem-solving in the discipline	Little evidence of the use of learning resources. Unable to work autonomously. Little input to teams. Very weak academic/intellectual skills. Work is significantly descriptive. A significant difficulty with structure/accuracy in expression	Little evidence of practical/professional/problem-solving skills. Little evidence of evaluative skills in respect of sources/data	Little evidence of the ability to select, use and evaluate IT applications and strategies which are appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Scant evidence of ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
10-19%	Inadequate knowledge base. Inadequate understanding of discipline/ethical issues. A major difficulty with theory	Inadequate use of learning resources. Unable to work autonomously. Inadequate input to teams. Extremely weak academic/intellectual skills. Work is significantly descriptive. A major difficulty with structure/accuracy in expression.	Inadequate practical/professional/problem-solving skills. Inadequate evaluative skills in respect of sources/data	Inadequate ability to select, use and evaluate IT applications and strategies which are appropriate for various purposes and tasks. Inadequate ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning

	and problem-solving in the discipline			methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
1-9%	No evidence of knowledge base; no evidence of understanding of discipline/ethical issues. Total inability with theory and problem-solving in discipline	No evidence of the use of learning resources. Completely unable to work autonomously. No evidence of input to teams. No evidence of academic/intellectual skills. Work wholly descriptive. Incoherent structure/accuracy and expression	No evidence of practical/professional/problem-solving skills. No evidence of the ability to evaluate sources/data	No evidence of the ability to select, use and evaluate IT applications and strategies which are appropriate for various purposes and tasks. No evidence of ability to reflect and evaluate their strengths, limitations and performance and the impact of these on their knowledge, learning methods, values/beliefs/ethics/employability
0%	Awarded for: (i) non-submission; (ii) dangerous practice; (iii) in situations where the student fails to address the assignment brief (eg: answers the wrong question) and/or related learning outcomes			

#### **4.4. Formative Assessment**

Module 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 module tutors to ensure that they have understood how to approach the assessment.

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.

Students cannot 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.

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.

Students are advised that any draft work that is submitted in advance of the deadline will only be permitted to have 20% of the work fed back on by module tutors. Students can specify which aspect they wish to be looked at.

#### **4.5. Summative Assessment and submission information**

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

Work submitted for a summative assessment component cannot be amended or re-submitted after the submission deadline. All coursework assignments and other forms of assessment must be submitted by the deadlines described within the module guides. Students should submit their assignments by 2pm on the deadline day. Assignments may be submitted prior to the deadline day, and this is advisable. Submission is online through Turnitin®UK. There is a designated page in the Canvas module for this. To be accepted by Turnitin, the submission must be a single file.

Graphs and tables in Microsoft Word documents sometimes show up incorrectly in Turnitin. Document containing graphs or 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.

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

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 module, the assignment and tutor who is to mark it. It is important you fill this out correctly (especially the tutor's name) so that the work is not misfiled in the office.

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 Module Leader. See the UCP-ASS002 HE Security of Summative Assessment Policy for details or the process and measures in place.

#### **4.6. Coursework Summative Feedback to students**

Module 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.

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. Feedback should include feedforward so that students can see areas of development.

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

#### **4.7. Late submission**

Where coursework is submitted late and there are no accepted extenuating circumstances it will be penalised in line with the following tariff:

- Submission within 6 working days: a 10% reduction deducted from the overall marked score for each working day late, down to the 40% pass mark (for UG) and 50% pass Mark (PG awards) and no further.
- Submission that is late by 7 or more working days: submission refused, mark of 0.
- A working day is defined by the partner and submission after the deadline will be assumed to be the next working day.
- Students who fail to submit work for assessments or attend examinations shall be deemed to have failed the assessments components concerned and will be marked as 0.

#### **4.8. Extensions and Extenuating Circumstances**

Please refer to the latest extension and extenuating circumstance policy on the [UCP Website](#).

#### **4.9. Credit**

- UK credit is double the value of its European Credit Transfer (ECTS) equivalent (e.g., 20 UK credits = 10 ECTS).
- Each module is assigned a single credit level, approved by the awarding body at validation. Module assessment is specific to its credit level.

- Credit is awarded when a student demonstrates achievement of the module's stated learning outcomes through appropriate assessment.
- Credit is not awarded if assessment is missing or improperly conducted.
- Credit points reflect the volume of learning, not the quality. Higher performance is recognised by grade, not by additional credit.

#### **4.10. Learning Outcomes**

All modules 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. They define academic standards for a module and describe the learning achievement of the successful student.

Module learning outcomes define a threshold standard of learning which all students who successfully complete the module are expected to be able to demonstrate. Module Leaders will write learning outcomes that can be assessed, and the assessment methods should be devised to ensure this. The learning outcomes will:

- Define a threshold level of learning.
- Be achievable within the notional learning hours or time constraints of the module.
- Be appropriate to the agreed level of learning.
- Be assessed.

#### **4.11. Assessment Qualify Marks**

A pass mark for the module is 40%. All learning outcomes at each level stage must also have been passed and at least 30% achieved in each assessment element.

Students who have not achieved the qualifying mark in each assessment element are deemed to have failed the module and are referred for re-assessment in all element(s) where less than 40% has been achieved, even if the aggregate mark for the module is 40% or higher.

#### **4.12. In class-tests/ Internally invigilated tests**

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

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

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.

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

#### **4.13. Records of assessment type, components, credits and learning outcomes**

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

- The content of Module Specification's is approved by the OU at the programmes validation event and stored on the Course file (Secure MS Teams Folder available to teaching staff and the Academic Office).

- The content of Module Specification is transcribed onto ProMonitor by the Academic Office staff. This includes the module title credit weighting, assessment elements, assessment type, Module Leader name.
- Course Leaders are responsible for providing the Academic Office with exam papers (first and second resit) and assignment briefs (including resubmission tasks) at least 3 weeks prior to the start of the semester the module is taught in. The assessment tasks must have been approved by External Examiners. The course content also needs to be added and/or checked on CANVAS every academic year.
- The Academic Office checks the information against the approved Module Specification and enters the assessment due date onto ProMonitor. Students enrolled on the module are also linked to the module occurrence on Promonitor.

## 5. Moderation

### 5.1. Internal Moderation of Assessment Design

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

Assessments need to be designed to be robust and designed 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.
- Authenticity – consider the knowledge and skills that are relevant in the workplace and that are valued by employers.

The Module Leader is responsible for coordinating the preparation of assessment tasks by the deadline set by the Academic Office. This must include:

- Review of assessment design by another member of the course team.
- Creation and review of assessment rubrics.
- Standardisation meeting of 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.
- Completion of internal moderation (IM) of assessment design by a separate member of the course team, who, in turn, will complete the IM1 form.

### 5.2. External Moderation of Assessment Design

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

For the OU the module guide, exam papers and assignment briefs (regardless of level) are all subject to external moderation by an External Examiner(s).

The External Examiner is required to confirm that:

- There is evidence of appropriate academic standards i.e., the task set.
- Is suitable for the level of the module and is comparable to similar provision elsewhere.
- 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 module's intended learning outcomes and content.

UCP Course Leaders work with ILT to provide access to CANVAS for the External Examiner (EE), who is then invited to access the course file. The EE will then review the module guide, assignment briefs, exam papers and the IM1 form, which is kept on CANVAS. The EE will then complete the EM1 form via CANVAS and inform the Course Leader once completed. If any changes to assessment design are required, the Course Leader will work with module leaders to make modifications.

### **5.3. Marking Moderation and Publication of Results**

#### **5.3.1 Internal Moderation**

Internal moderation and external moderation of assessment decisions and feedback is to be completed on one form (EM2 - Appendix 3). Scripts should be accessed via Canvas by all assessors, internal and external moderators; except whereby increase file sizes of submissions require the files to be downloaded and shared with internal and external moderators via a cloud-based platform, such as Google Drive.

The EM2 form will be saved in stored with the Academic Office and shared directly with the internal and external moderators by the Course Leader.

Where a module has more students than the minimum moderation requirement (see below), Course Leaders will clearly identify learners to be moderated to the internal and external moderators.

Course Leaders will be responsible for the completion of the EM2 form.

First markers will complete the assessment process (awarding grades and providing feedback) within Canvas and will alert the designated internal moderator once it has been completed.

The first marker selects a sample for internal moderation which:

- comprises a minimum of eight items or 10% (whichever is the greater) of the assessed work which he/she has marked for each assessment element contributing 25% or more of the overall assessment for a module. The minimum may be exceeded to address the remaining criteria below;
  - covers the range of marks identified within the marksheet;
  - addresses any external requirements such as those of Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs);
  - takes account of any support required by the HE Manager for new and/or inexperienced first markers.

Once the internal moderator has agreed the marking standards of the sample provided, they will sign the EM2 Form (see Appendix 3) in the "Module Details" section and provide appropriate comments in the "Internal Moderation" section.

They will then alert the Module Leader that this has been completed.

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.

Course Leaders are advised to keep a grade tracker for all modules, which will be held by the Academic Office. Once the module marking is confirmed the Course Leader uses their grade tracker to enter results onto Markbook (via ProMonitor). Course Leaders must audit the marks on ProMonitor against the grade tracker. The deadline published by the Academic Office must be adhered to.

Marks entered during the marking and moderation period are hidden from students on Markbook (via ProMonitor). The Academic Office is responsible for restricting students access until results are approved after the Exam Board. Provisional marks (i.e., those that have been internally moderated but not yet ratified by an Exam 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 section 50.

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

### 5.3.2 External Moderation of Scripts

Assessed work at all levels are subject to external moderation at the initial assessment point (e.g., the end of Semester/Trimester 1 for modules delivered in Semester/Trimester 1). The regulations relating to EEs can be found in section F2 of the Handbook for Validated Awards.

Course Leaders will send the EM2 form to the external moderator to alert them that modules are ready to be moderated, by the internal deadline agreed in the UCP Academic Calendar, set by the Academic Office. External moderators will access student work, marks and feedback via Canvas. This is a protected and secure area, with set permissions given to the external moderators to enable to access the correct files.

The external moderation sample includes the following information, which Course Leaders will ensure is available for the External Examiners on Canvas:

- a full schedule of all marks achieved by all students registered for the module, clearly indicating which examples of work have been included in the sample;
- the relevant Module Specification;
- the Generic Assessment Criteria and Marking Standards/marketing scheme for each assessment task;
- a minimum of eight items or 10% (whichever is the greater) of the assessed work for each assessment element contributing 25% or more of the overall assessment
- covers the full range of marks identified within the final marksheet;
- covers borderlines, fails and distinctions;
- includes work submitted by any IEG staff member studying on the programme;
- covers all markers;
- addresses any external requirements such as those of PSRBs.

External Examiners are required to complete the moderation process by the Exam Board deadline.

Assessments which have not been externally moderated will be securely stored on Canvas until the date the awarding bodies have notified it can be released.

An External Examiner may propose to the Exam Board that, based on their sample moderation:

- all marks for a particular assessment task are moderated up;
- all marks for a particular assessment task are moderated down;
- all marks for a particular assessment task are re-marked due to inconsistencies in the marking process (in such cases, the External Examiner provides guidance on the issues that need to be addressed when the re-marking occurs).

The Exam Board cannot agree to moderate the marks of individual candidates unless the External Examiner has moderated all assessed work for all candidates.

Course Leaders are expected to discuss with Module Tutors feedback on assessment provided by the External Examiner at the Assessment Board and in the annual External Examiner Report.

## **6. Archiving of Students' Assessed Work**

Course leaders should maintain a securely held archive of sample marked student work that is representative of the range of assessment tasks and grades awarded, for the purposes of quality audit, staff induction and development, and monitoring and benchmarking of standards. The sample should be retained in line with the HE 5-year Data Retention Schedule.

## **7. Academic Misconduct**

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

## **8. Examination Boards**

### **8.1. Principles**

Every programme of study leading to an award must have an Exam Board each semester (These usually run in February/June/August – resits).

Exam Boards consider the academic progress of individual based. The performance of module assessment and teaching is discussed.

The Exam Boards which include representation from the appropriate awarding body, reports to the Awarding Body Awards Board (known as Module Results Approval and Qualifications Classification Panel -MRAQCP by the Open University).

The date for all formal meetings scheduled at UCP is published 12 calendar months in advance.

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

The responsibility of the Exam Board is to:

- a) Review of formal presentation of module 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 module/unit results and the award of the associated credit to determine for a student who has failed a module/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 modules/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.

## 8.2. Attendees

Attendees include:

- a) Chair – a senior member of staff, someone independent of the programme/subject area being considered
- b) Secretary to the Board (Academic Officer (or equivalent)
- c) Module Leaders
- d) Tutors responsible for teaching or assessing
- e) External Examiner(s) for each programme being considered at the board
- f) Awarding Body Representative

The following members must attend for the decisions of a meeting to be valid unless unforeseen circumstances exceptionally prevent attendance. In which case appropriate alternative arrangements should be made provided the circumstances arise an enough time in advance of the meeting:

- a) One representative from each Faculty.
- b) All External Examiners.
- c) 50% of the Module Leaders (or their named substitute) whose modules are under consideration.
- d) Awarding body representative.

Members will be asked to declare any interest that could give rise to conflict in relation to any item on the agenda at the beginning of the meeting. All interests disclosed will be recorded in the minutes. If the Chair of the meeting deems it appropriate, the member shall absent himself or herself from all or part of the discussion of the matter.

If the quorum is not achieved within 15 minutes of the formal start time of the meeting as indicated on the agenda, then the meeting can either be dismissed by the Chair or carried out on an informal basis. If a meeting is not quorate, decisions are not valid. Recommendations of inquorate meetings can, however, be ratified at the next quorate meeting.

At every meeting attendance shall be recorded, and all proceedings minuted. The minutes, once verified provisionally by the Chair of the Academic Board, are circulated to members and a copy held by the Academic Office.

### **8.3. Agenda**

The Chair ensures that the Exam Board acts in accordance with its Terms of Reference and that it does not make decisions when it is inquorate.

Please note that the June Exam Board is face-to-face, whereas the February/August are online.

All Exam Boards must include the following standard agenda items:

- a) Welcome and apologies
- b) Confirmation that the Panel is quorate and therefore able to take decisions
- c) Declaration of Conflict of Interest
- d) Confirmation of the minutes of the previous meeting
- e) Confirmation that students have taken modules/units that lead to the qualifications under the jurisdiction of the Panel
- f) Matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting
- g) Details of any Chair's Actions taken since last meeting
- h) HE Course Leader/ Module Leader presentation of module mark sheets and report on delivery and assessment of each module to include where appropriate;
  - I. the grades achieved by students on the individual modules/units
  - II. Complaints pertinent to the proceedings of the board
- i) Comments from External Examiners on the appropriateness of assessment, marks and standard of feedback
- j) Consideration of any proposed moderation of marks for individual assessment tasks (not individual candidates), based on advice from the relevant External Examiner
- k) Confirmation from the External Examiners that the standard of any awards to be made is comparable with that of similar awards elsewhere
- l) Review of recommendation form the Pre-Student Review Panel:
  - I. Academic Misconduct cases
  - II. Academic Appeals cases
  - III. Referrals and deferrals
  - IV. Progression of students on to the next stage of the programme
- m) Approval of recommendations for progression.
- n) Reminder that discussions and decisions taken at the Panel are confidential
- o) Any other business
- p) Date of next meeting confirmed
- q) Collection of confidential papers by the Secretary to the Board (or information about deleting documents where board held remotely)
- r) Signing of Award Recommendation paperwork – conducted by email for remote meetings

### **8.4. Preparation – Data and Documentation**

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.

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

### **8.5. Post meeting**

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.

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

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

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

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

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

### **8.6. Communication of decisions to Students**

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

Students are informed if they have failed a summative assessment submission by email and 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 Module Leader. It is the student's responsibility to check their assessment results and reading published guidance.

### **8.7. Results Process**

Results from online tests which must be generated by the Exams Office will be sent to the tutor who requested the test no later than one working day after the exam.

Tutors are responsible for distributing coursework back to students after the release date.

The Academic Office is responsible for communicating outcomes of the Exam Board to students and other relevant sections of the institution. Confirmed assessment element and module results are published by the Academic Office to students on ProMonitor by set dates in accordance with the academic calendar published on the UCP website [www.ucp.ac.uk/key-dates/](http://www.ucp.ac.uk/key-dates/), on CANVAS and in module guides.

The Academic Office is responsible for communicating student's progression decisions, after confirmation at the Exam Board, to students and other relevant sections of the institution. Students' progression decisions are confirmed by the Academic Office to students on ProMonitor by setting dates in accordance with the academic calendar published on the UCP website [www.ucp.ac.uk/key-dates/](http://www.ucp.ac.uk/key-dates/), on CANVAS and in module guides.

Where retrieval of failed modules after the first attempt involves the re-submission of an assessment, it is the responsibility of the students concerned to contact the Module Leader/Tutor to obtain precise details of the re-assessment task(s).

## 9. Module and Component Assessment Scores

All undergraduate assessment elements will be marked on a percentage scale. These are published to students on Promonitor:

BSc/BA/BEng		
% Scale Score	Band	Performance Standard
70+	A	Excellent pass
60-69	B	Very Good pass
50-59	C	Good Pass
40-49	D	Pass
0-39	F	Fail
FD/DipHE		
% Scale Score	Band	Performance Standard
70+	DS	Distinction
60-69	ME	Merit
40-59	PA	Pass
0-39	F	Fail

Where the result of the overall assessment calculation creates a mark of 0.5% or greater, this will be rounded up to the next full percentage point (e.g., 69.5% is rounded to 70%; 59.5% to 60%; and so on). Where the calculation creates a mark below 0.5%, this will be rounded down to the next full percentage point (e.g., 69.4% is rounded to 69%; 59.4% to 59%; and so on). For the purposes of rounding up or down, only the first decimal place is used.

## 10. Degree Classifications

Honours degrees are classified as:

First class	Aggregate mark of 70% or above
Upper Second class	Aggregate mark between 60% and 69%
Lower Second class	Aggregate mark between 50% and 59%
Third class	Aggregate mark between 40% and 49%

Classification of bachelor's degrees will be based on the average mark across all modules within Stage 3 (usually Credit Level 6) and Stage 2 (usually Credit Level 5) at a ratio of 2:1 respectively unless the requirements of a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) state otherwise.

Calculation of a Foundation Degree/DipHE will be based on the average mark across all modules within Stage 2 (usually Credit Level 5) and Stage 1 (usually Credit level 4) unless the requirements of a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) state otherwise.

## 11. Certificates

Formal award lists are prepared by the awarding body upon receipt of award recommendation documentation which determine the awards to be conferred, and certificates subsequently produced.

All students receive a transcript of results posted to candidates' home addresses. Final award certificates are posted (recorded delivery) to candidate's current home address. Certificates may be collected from the Exams Office on behalf of a candidate by a third party, provided they have been authorised to do so. The centre retains printed certificates for one year after which it is shredded. In the event of lost certificates duplicates may be purchased by the candidate from the awarding bodies.

All certificates will be recorded on the Student Management System by the Exams Office.

Certificates for staff members will be processed and available for collection by staff within two weeks of receipt. Staff will be notified of collection arrangements by email. Staff will be required to sign for their certificate(s).

UCP will not pay costs incurred by the loss of certificates if the candidate failed to notify UCP of a change of address by the end of the academic year.

For genuine cases of lost certificates, UCP will pay for a replacement certificate within 1 year of its issue from the awarding body. Any replacements required due to non-receipt of certificates posted out by the Exams Office but greater than 1 year after issue will be the responsibility of the candidate to contact the Awarding Body and arrange and pay for reprint(s).

Where certificates are returned by Royal Mail as undeliverable these will be held in secure storage for a period of 12 months and then securely destroyed.

Cost incurred to replace certificates because of data issues such as incorrect name/date of birth will be charged to the student if they have failed to have their details amended before certification or re-charged to the originating department. These amendments must have been made on the correct forms and left either with UCP Reception or MIS team. Change of address forms available from reception, change of name must be notified by deed poll.

**APPENDIX 1**



University Centre  
**Peterborough**  
Part of the Inspire Education Group

**FORM:IM1**  
**Internal Moderation of**  
**Assessment Design**

This template supports transparency in the moderation process and provides a record of the internal and external moderation decision. Completion of all sections within the template electronically will assist moderation processes. The comment boxes will expand as they are populated

**Academic Year:**

**Programme:**

**Semester:**

**Course Leaders:**

**Internal Moderators:**

**General pages**

<b>Module Name</b>	Name A	Name B	Name C										
<b>Module Code</b>													
<b>Level</b>													
<b>Element</b>													
<b>Assessment type</b>													

**General Module Instructions**

- Add module codes, indicate yes or no (Y/N).
- If required for N, provide comments in the section below the table
- Add comments regarding good practice or common issues in the section below the table

Module code											
a) Module Leader name matches the name on the current specification											
b) Module Leader name and email address is supplied											
c) Module code and title match the current specification											
d) Semester delivered in matches the current specification											
e) Schedule of teaching is included and is clear											
f) Formative Assessment dates have been added											
g) Resit Assessment is clearly stated											
h) Is the language appropriate and inclusive?											
i) All red text has been replaced and turned black											

j) External Examiner Area set up on Module												
k) Weekly resources available												

**Comments including good practice/common issues**

E.g. A)BHR302 – Missing email address

**Assessment details guidance**

- Add module codes, indicate yes or no (Y/N)
- If required for N, provide comments in the section below the table
- Add comments regarding good practice or common issues in the section below the table

Module code												
a) Assessment due dates match the module specification												
b) Start and Until date (6 working days after start date) are correct												
c) The assessment assesses learning outcomes as set out in the module specification												

d) The assignment brief (or question paper) clearly states requirements												
e) The language used is appropriate and inclusive, free for from errors.												
f) The assignment brief (or question paper) is complete including handouts, formula sheets etc.												
g) There is a full set of solutions that match the questions/ assignment.												
h) The assessment questions are not identical to those used from the previous academic session												
i) The assessment rubric is correct and attached to the assessment												
j) Resit Assessment is stated												
k) Resit Assessment is in same format as above												

**Comments including good practice/common issues**

E.g. A)BHR302 – Assessment date for E11 missing

Internal Moderator Name:

Signature:

Date:

***ONCE INTERNALLY MODERATED AND MODULE LEADER HAS COMPLETED ACTIONS REQUIRED PLEASE SAVE IN YOUR COURSE FILE.***

***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.***



External Examiners should approve the content of all assessment tasks for those modules on the IM1 form which contribute towards the classification of students' individual awards (e.g.: examinations, coursework, presentations) at level 5 or higher. This allows the External Examiner's expertise 'to inform institutions' practice as it occurs, rather than providing an exclusively retrospective comment on past practice' (UK Quality Code for HE chapter B7).

<b>Programme:</b>	
<b>Date of external review:</b>	
<b>External Examiner Name:</b>	

**What is being moderated?**

- Module Guide
- Assignments (Report, essay, case study)
- Practical (in class test, lab activity)
- Exam

1. Comments on the clarity, fairness, coverage of the learning outcomes and consistency of the proposed assessments, including whether it is at an appropriate level of study and comparability with similar provision elsewhere

2. Please add comments and indicate any recommended changes or amendments

3. General comments / feedback, including any action to be taken

**Action:**

**No action required / Action to be completed**

**Module Leader's response to External Moderator's comments**

Suggested changes implemented by Module Leader:     Yes     No

If no, please state why the changes have not been implemented:

 <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle; margin-left: 10px;"> <p><b>University Centre Peterborough</b> <small>Part of the Inspire Education Group</small></p> </div>	<p><b>MODERATION FORM EM2</b></p>
--	-----------------------------------

### Moderation of Marking and feedback

For Level 4, 5, and 6 modules contributing to award classification, samples must:

- comprise a minimum of eight items or 10% (whichever is the greater) of the assessed work for each assessment element. These minima may be exceeded in order to address the following criteria;
  - covers the full range of marks identified within the final marksheet;
  - includes all fails, all first class (70% and above) and all those on the borderline of grade classes (49% – 51%, 59% - 61% and 69- 71%)
  - covers all markers;
  - covers all locations of delivery;
  - addresses any external requirements such as those of PSRBs.

<b>External Examiner name:</b>					
<b>External Examiner signature:</b>					
<b>Date of external review:</b>					
<b>Main course from which modules derive:</b>					
<b>List of samples for external moderation</b>					
Module Details		Internal Moderation		External Moderation	
Name: Code:  Assessor: Internal Moderator: Date:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	
	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	
Name: Code:  Assessor: Internal Moderator: Date:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	
	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	

Name: Code:  Assessor: Internal Moderator: Date:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:
	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:
Name: Code:  Assessor: Internal Moderator: Date:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:
	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:
Name: Code:  Assessor: Internal Moderator: Date:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:
	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:
Name: Code:  Assessor: Internal Moderator: Date:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	010	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:
	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:	011	<input type="checkbox"/> Grades agreed <input type="checkbox"/> Adjust all grades by ....% <input type="checkbox"/> Re-mark all scripts Comment:

**Signed:** External Examiner \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_