



3.0 Academic Regulations

3.3 Assessment Policy

Approved in	Academic Board April 2024
Version Number	3
Reviewed by	Deputy Principal Academic April 2024

Version Control Statement

Version	Date	Changes	Reason	Author	Next review
1	July 2021	New Policy		Deputy Principal Academic	Sept 2022
2	Aug 2022	Minor adjustments	Annual Review	Deputy Principal Academic	Sept 2023

External Reference Points

This Policy provides practical guidelines on how EDA College will ensure that the four primary regulatory objectives of OFS are fulfilled, particularly condition B2 and B3 of the Regulatory Framework (2017)

It is developed based on the QAA Quality Code, Advice and Guidance on Learning and Teaching, and references:

- Course Design and Development
- Admissions
- Assessment
- Learning and Teaching
- External Expertise
- Enabling student achievement
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Student Engagement
- Work-based Learning

Related Policies and Documents

Affects all other policy documents. This document should however be read together with the following documents:

- Programme Approval Policy
- Admissions Policy
- Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Learning and Teaching Strategy
- Retention, Attendance and Student Support Policy
- Quality Assurance Policy

Contents

Introduction	5
Aims of this Policy	5
Standardisation of Use of Terms	6
<i>Module:</i>	6
<i>Marker:</i>	6
<i>Internal Verifier (IV):</i>	6
<i>External Examiner:</i>	6
Scope of the Policy	7
Basic Principles	7
Assessment for Entry Requirements onto a Programme	8
<i>Entry Tests</i>	8
<i>Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)</i>	8
RPL Assessment Method	8
Teaching and Assessment Calendars	9
Assessment Methodologies	9
The Design of Assessment briefs	10
Assessment of Student Work	11
<i>Marking</i>	11
Feedback	12
• Timely:	12
• Developmental:	12
• Encouraging Feedback:	13
<i>Formative Feedback</i>	13
<i>Summative Feedback</i>	13
Academic Misconduct	13
Quality Assurance Processes on Assessments	13
<i>Standardisation</i>	13
Internal Verification/Double Marking/Internal Quality Assurance	15
Security of Assessment Practices through Staff Development and Training	17

Further actions 17

Areas to be sampled 19

CPD of Markers 19

Assessment and Awards Boards 20

Awards and Certificate Claims 21

Principles 21

Grades Awarded 21

Award Claims Process 22

External Examiner/Verifier/External Quality Assurance Review 22

Use of Other External Expertise 23

Student Involvement 23

Assessment Policy

Introduction

EDA College (EDA) believes that assessment is a critical part of the learning process and a fundamental aspect of the overall student experience. The College, therefore, considers assessment for students as necessary to:

- facilitate student learning by providing appropriate feedback on performance
- allow students to demonstrate that they have fulfilled the intended aims and learning outcomes of the programme of study
- measure student achievement objectively against the learning outcomes of modules; across all programmes
- ensure that threshold standards are consistently met within the assessment process

This resonates with the statement in the QAA Quality Code:

For students,

“Engagement in assessment activities and interaction with staff and peers enables learning, both as part of the task and thorough review of their performance. It is a vehicle for obtaining feedback. Ultimately, it determines whether each student has achieved their course’s learning outcomes and allows the awarding body to ensure that appropriate standards are being applied rigorously”.

Aims of this Policy

This policy seeks to ensure that: -

- the College has in place effective arrangements to enable the standards of the awards it offers on behalf of its awarding partners to remain credible and secure, irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them. The assessment process is designed to determine whether each student has achieved these standards.
- assessment processes within EDA confirm that the qualifications the College offers are awarded only to those students who meet the specified learning outcomes.

- assessment processes confirm that students who are awarded qualifications can achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.
- learners have appropriate opportunities to show that they have achieved the intended Learning Outcomes for the award of a qualification or credit on their programme of study.
- assessment design, marking and moderation reflect how requirements from the awarding partners, for awards and classification, are met.
- in work settings, where the College works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.
- assessment processes are fair, rigorous, robust, transparent, and consistent.
- staff provide all students with constructive and detailed feedback, promptly, to encourage students to improve the quality of their work.

Standardisation of Use of Terms

Different Awarding partners use different terms for the same processes. The following outlines the terms that have been standardised for some terms used by the different awarding partners:

Module: Some awarding partners may use the unit. The term Module is used as a standard term for both modules and units.

Marker: Some partners give room for the use of separate staff for teaching and assessing student work. Staff assessing student work are therefore often referred to as assessors. In this policy, the marker is a term used for both marker and assessor.

Internal Verifier (IV): Awarding partners may term staff who check the assessments of other members of staff internal verifiers (IV), second markers or Internal Quality Assurers (IQA). The term IV is used to represent all the different terms in this policy.

External Examiner: External members of staff who check assessment processes may be referred to as External Examiners, External Verifiers, and External Quality Assurers. For purpose of this policy, External Examiner is applied in place of all the different terms.

Scope of the Policy

EDA requires that assessments be tailored to different environments, including work placements. Assessment may be used in the selection and admission of applicants onto a programme. These include the initial assessments for literacy, numeracy and ICT competency or recognition of prior learning to ensure only applicants with the necessary entry requirements or requisite credits for entry onto a programme are admitted onto the programme.

This policy recognises that the College's Strategic Plan to expand its provision through new programmes and partners may place differing demands on the College and is therefore designed to accommodate different assessment approaches to ensure the maintenance of threshold standards regardless of the programme or on behalf of which awarding partner the programme is run. Learning outcomes are specified for each course, which is consistent with the relevant national qualification frameworks' descriptors.

Where the assessment is for one of the partner's programmes, the assessment policy of the Partner institution takes precedence.

Basic Principles

The College will ensure that its lecturers are highly qualified and experienced in the assessment of the subject they are delivering and are supported and developed accordingly. The College strongly upholds the principle that all students need to maintain academic integrity. This includes guidance by lecturers on effective use of the appropriate referencing systems (currently the Harvard System of Referencing system is applied across all programmes), footnotes, bibliography and avoiding plagiarism, paraphrasing, collusion, ghost writing and how to avoid various forms of assessment malpractice. The use of a range of assessment methods reduces the likelihood of assessment malpractice.

Where group work is undertaken and assessed, students are expected to outline their contributions and to be able to answer on any aspect of the group's work and not just their contributions. This approach aims to ensure that students benefit from working in groups, but also take responsibility for their contribution, actively interacting with the group and learning from other group members.

The College takes great care in ensuring that programme modules are sequenced in a way as to complement each other wherever possible and allow enough time for students to complete the activities.

Where appropriate, the indicative characteristics for each grade descriptor used within modules must be effectively contextualised and it is clear to lecturers and students what evidence needs to be generated to achieve a specific grade.

Assessment for Entry Requirements onto a Programme

The College require that some groups of students take entry tests to ensure that they meet some minimum requirements for entry onto the programme. The purpose of these tests is to ensure only students who are capable of completing their studies are admitted to the programme they are applying for.

The tests may also be used to identify support needs for applicants before they are admitted onto a programme. Entry tests may also include cases where students wish to claim credits for entry onto a programme through the recognition of prior learning.

Entry Tests

Entry tests should be at the correct level or equivalent, for example where applicants are required to have Level 2 competency in English Literacy, appropriate tests should be administered. They should be assessed by appropriately qualified staff.

Procedures for marking the completed assessments and for the quality assurance of the test scripts and assessed work should be as below.

Security of test papers and completed work should be ensured using the examination procedures given below.

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

Recognition for prior learning is a valid method of enabling individuals to claim credit for prior learning. It is a student-centred voluntary process, with the individual being offered advice on the nature and range of evidence considered appropriate, to support a claim for credit through RPL, and be given guidance and support to make such a claim.

RPL should be administered by the requirements of the awarding partner.

Where awarding partners have stated procedures for the recognition of prior learning, applicants must be fully informed that they may be able to claim credit for some of their previous learning and of the procedures for making such claims ahead of their enrolment.

RPL Assessment Method

The process of assessment for RPL is subject to the same quality assurance and monitoring standards as any other form of assessment as given below. Evidence required may include work experience records, validated by managers, previous portfolios of evidence put together by the learner and validated as being their work and essays and reports validated as being the learner's unaided work.

Assessment must be valid and reliable to ensure the integrity of the award of credit and meet the standards of the module for which the assessment is being used. The award of credit through RPL will not be distinguished from any other credit award. Assessment methods for RPL must be of equal rigour to other assessment methods, be fit for purpose and relate to the evidence of learning. Credit may be claimed for any module through RPL unless the assessment requirements of the module do not allow this. RPL can be used for transferring across various learning programmes where learners possess relevant learning but do not hold relevant credits or certificates.

In assessing a module using RPL, the marker familiar with delivering and assessing the module must be satisfied that the evidence produced by the learner meets the assessment standard established by the learning outcome and its related assessment criteria. If the currency of any evidence is in doubt, the marker may use questions to check understanding and competence.

Once the internal and external quality assurance procedures have been completed and approved by the Assessment Panel, verification claims can be made, with related records held for three years.

Teaching and Assessment Calendars

Students should be given clear teaching and assessment calendars, allowing assessments to be released in good time (for example in the first three weeks of the teaching schedule) to encourage students to think ahead and to start planning early.

Assessment requirements should always be made available within the virtual learning environment at the same time as the assessments.

Staff are required to split assessment requirements into multiple elements spread over specific calendar periods to help the students to achieve the learning outcomes required. Such a bite-size approach enables learners to develop their work on an incremental note.

Assessment Methodologies

Varied assessment methodologies must be used depending upon the learning outcomes and the requirements of the programme as dictated by the awarding organisations. They may include written course work, group or individual presentations, case study analyses, timed assessments, group discussions, products of work, witness statements, professional discussions, written or oral examinations and direct observations.

The variety of assessment methodologies should allow the students to reflect on their work and assist them in developing subject and generic skills such as research skills, time-management skills, self-management skills, cognitive skills, presentation skills, functional skills, and team-building skills.

All written assessments require the students to undertake some research activity and encourage an application of knowledge, an evaluation of alternative methodologies, and the development of lateral thinking techniques.

All assessments must include Formative Assessment tasks within timetabled hours to prepare students for the Summative Assessment.

The Design of Assessment briefs

All assignment briefs where appropriate should include a section that explains the meaning of command verbs guides each task and clearly articulates the evidence that students need to generate.

Lecturers should provide further guidance on how to interpret assignment brief tasks and guide students on how to approach each assessment method used.

All assessment briefs for all modules across all programmes must meet the standards set by the relevant awarding organisation.

These should include the following:

- accurate programme details
- accurate modules details
- clear task issues and submission deadlines given
- details of how the FHEQ guidelines have been applied
- all learning outcomes and assessment criteria listed next to each task
- where appropriate, criteria and guidelines for students to achieve higher grades should be listed and be contextualised
- the tasks must be drafted to meet the requirements of the grading criteria to be addressed
- clear guidelines concerning the evidence the learner is required to generate for each specified task
- appropriate activities for each task
- scenario or vocational context
- use of appropriate language and presentation for the level of learner
- appropriate timescale for the assignment and individual tasks

In addition, the assessment brief **must**:

- Provide opportunities for students to cover all learning outcomes and assessment criteria as set out in the specification supplied by the awarding partner including guidelines for the achievement of higher grades.

- Be sufficiently amended on an annual note to minimise the risk of plagiarism and ensure it remains vocationally relevant and up to date. This may include changing the scenario, assessment methods for tasks and the evidence range to be generated (changing the scenario content alone may not be enough).
- Best practice in assessment design should be shared and, wherever possible and reasonable, applied across programmes (subject to programme and specification constraints).

Assessment of Student Work

The Assessment Calendar should allow for the submission of student work in the last week of scheduled contact.

Late submissions and re-submissions will be considered by the Assessment Panel for approval. All late and re-submissions are graded from the minimum pass grade such as a Pass if the Awarding Partner uses the Pass, Merit and Distinction and Referral for grading.

Marking

- lecturers (markers) are responsible for marking all submitted assessments unless other arrangements have been approved by the Programme Leader and/or Academic Manager
- all assessments, except for written exams and physical portfolios, are marked online
- the marker must aim for their marking to be completed within 1 week after submission for the current cohort size
- the marking must be guided by (FHEQ) and subject benchmarks
- the assessments must be marked in an impartial, valid, and reliable manner
- wherever required by the awarding partner, anonymous marking should be applied
- feedback should indicate which assessment outcomes
- where outcomes are not achieved, students must be informed of what could have been done to meet the grade

- Similarly, for those learning outcomes that have been achieved, lecturers must indicate what students should have done to achieve higher grades
- Percentage grading using the rubric provided by the awarding partner

Feedback

Feedback should be provided to students about learning outcomes and assessment criteria that are linked to a specific assessment. Feedback should identify the strengths and weaknesses of the assessed work. Comments should be made on the level of attainment concerning each learning outcome.

Written feedback must be legible, and can be either handwritten or, preferably, word-processed.

Students will receive feedback on every piece of assessed coursework including dissertations and project reports.

Coursework should be returned to students according to agreed timescales. Students are also entitled to feedback on assignments.

Feedback should;

- Facilitate the development of self-assessment (reflection) in learning
- Encourages teacher and peer dialogue about learning
- Help clarify what good performance is in terms of expected standards
- Provide opportunities to close the gap between current and desired performance
- Deliver high-quality information to students about their learning
- Encourage positive information to students about their learning
- Provide information to teachers that can be used to shape teaching

For all assessed work, other than examinations, all academic staff involved in assessment should ensure that feedback provided is timely, developmental, and encouraging.

- **Timely:** Feedback should be returned as quickly as practically possible, preferably, in sufficient time for students to be able to review the work to improve, based on feedback, the next related piece of work.
- **Developmental:** Students need to know how to correct their mistakes. Focused, specific comments on aspects of the work will help students to understand key points. Clear marking criteria which articulate the important aspects of the piece of work provide a framework against which feedback can be given.

- **Encouraging Feedback:** should offer a balance of encouraging comments and criticism. Feedback should state what is good about the work as well as what could be improved.

Formative Feedback

Formative feedback (also known as formative assessment, formative evaluation, or assessment for learning) should be a continuous process, intended to modify teaching and learning activities to improve student achievement. A range of formal and informal assessment procedures should be conducted during the learning process.

Formative feedback should not provide a grade to a student. It should therefore be qualitative, providing details of content and performance and should be developmental. In addition to formative feedback provided during the learning process, the College encourages teaching staff to provide formative feedback on assessments.

Formative feedback should be given to students as soon as possible after the submission of work. Students who submit their work within the first two weeks of the four-week submission window should receive formative feedback on their submissions.

Summative Feedback

For summative work, feedback including the approved grade/mark will be given to students after the appropriate Assessment and Standardisation Board meeting.

Summative feedback should be provided to the students as soon after the Assessment Panel as possible.

Academic Misconduct

When academic misconduct is suspected, the lecturer should bring this to the attention of the relevant Module Leader who will initially investigate the concern. The lecturer should provide the evidence of suspected academic malpractice to the Module Leader who should then meet with the student along with the Programme Leader. The student should be allowed to present his or her case. The Programme Leader will then refer the case to the Academic Lead in line with the Academic Misconduct Policy.

Quality Assurance Processes on Assessments

Standardisation

Assessment standardisation is a process for checking internal assessment instruments and confirming that standards of marking are consistent across the board. During the

standardisation processes, staff should reflect on how the assessment process maintains the security of threshold standards and that the standards remain consistent with FHEQ.

The process seeks to ensure that all students are assessed consistently and fairly across the whole provision regardless of who assesses them. The following are the guiding principles:

- wherever two or more staff teach one module the team should meet to agree on the approaches to assessment, and agree on the content of the assessment brief/examination paper
- the Module Leaders coordinate the standardisation process
- wherever disagreements take place, the Programme Leader may intervene and bring the team to an agreement
- the Academic Development Lead may be called in to resolve issues as a last resort if an agreement cannot be reached
- soon after standardisation, one member of staff is given responsibility for drafting the assessment briefs
- Similarly, before the marking process, a standardisation process on marking should take place as soon after the final submission date as possible
- all members teaching a module are given a few scripts for assessment, each assessing the same scripts
- the grades are compiled onto a table for comparison and a standardisation meeting is convened at which the grades are compared and discussed in detail
- marking should take place immediately after the standardisation process
- Programme Leaders receive all standardisation minutes and prepare a report for the Assessment Panel, indicating where disagreements were encountered, how they were resolved, and the nature and frequency of disagreements

- where major disagreements occur and justify a change in Policy, the Assessment Panel recommends such action to the Academic Board for approval and implementation

There should be a minimum of 3 standardisation meetings for each programme per year. The markers for those programmes must attend these meetings.

The aim of these meetings is:

- ensure accuracy and consistency of assessment decisions
- ensure consistent quality of delivery
- improve and develop the practice of markers

The agenda for these meetings will be based on areas of practice identified through sampling, observation of delivery and assessment, feedback from External Examiner/Verifier/External Quality Assurer (External Examiner) visits/sampling or because of changes to qualifications standards.

All staff will receive a copy of the minutes via e-mail within 1 week of the meeting.

Internal Verification/Double Marking/Internal Quality Assurance

The Internal Verification/Double marking (where applicable depending on requirements of the awarding organisation)/Internal Quality Assurance (IV) process ensures that assessment and delivery staff are assessing student work to the correct standard.

The College will ensure all assessment briefs/examination papers, have been internally verified, even where the awarding partner does not specifically request this process to take place.

Any discrepancies found during this process will be resolved by the Assessment Panels. Should a resolution not be found, it would then be referred to the Academic Development Lead to mediate markers and arrive at the correct grade for the assessments. Once this occurs, the marker will adjust their assessment and grading accordingly for the assessment/grading of the remaining assignments

The following procedure must be followed, for checking assessment briefs and examination papers:

- an IV schedule detailing the name of each lecturer who has taken on the responsibility to draft the assessment brief/examination paper and the internal verifier for each assignment brief/examination paper

- all assignment briefs/examination papers for every module across all programmes are internally verified using up-to-date awarding organisation documentation (wherever applicable) before being issued to students
- where appropriate, and wherever possible, formative feedback must be given to the marker indicating areas for improvement or possible aspects to be considered in the future
- the names and signatures of the marker and internal verifier must be provided
- relevant action(s) identified must be listed with clear deadlines shown
- actions completed must be signed-off by the author of the assessment/assignment and the internal verifier
- assignment briefs are internally verified by the appointed Internal Verifier to ensure:
 - the tasks and evidence allow the student to address the targeted criteria and achieve the intended learning outcomes
 - the brief is written in a clear and accessible language
 - the tasks are vocationally relevant and appropriate to the level of the qualification
 - timescales and deadlines are appropriate
 - equal opportunities are incorporated
- internal verification for assessed work should take place immediately after marking
- for assessments, the marker forwards assessments to the designated internal verifiers for internal verification

Security of Assessment Practices through Staff Development and Training

The IV process should also serve to support staff development. This will ensure that assessment practices of staff remain secure, with any issues being addressed through the IV processes. A risk assessment approach using the traffic light system is applied in deciding the size of the sample to be taken for the IV process for each member of staff. More samples of student work should be taken for any new or inexperienced members of staff according to the grid below.

Markers may move between bands. Movement upwards can only take place one band at a time. Markers may also move downwards one band at a time or straight to band 1 – red. The IV team must keep records of the banding and document all movements and reasons for these movements.

Each IV must ensure that the markers in their team are risk banded and a rationale for the current banding is recorded.

Band	Description	% IQ
RED	Marker new to EDA or the practice, marker working towards a marker qualification (for some awarding partners) and marker with significant action points identified during recent samples	100%
AMBER	Newly qualified marker or one with minor action points identified during recent samples	70%
YELLOW	Marker showing minor actions during recent IV samples	50%
GREEN	Marker working within the requirements proving consistency in assessment decisions over a period	33.3

Further actions

Band 1 – Red

It may be necessary to move a Marker to this band where a qualification has been re-written (the standards have changed) or the marker a marker is qualified and deemed red/band the IV must ensure that a development plan is put into place.

This marker may move from red to amber when the following criteria have been satisfied.

- The marker qualification has been achieved
- The IV has sampled five assessments/portfolios and no changes were suggested
- The development plan for the transition from red to amber has been achieved

A review every 4 weeks to include observations of delivery/assessment as an appropriate and on-going sampling of all decisions on all learning outcomes until the Marker regularly demonstrates accuracy and/or consistency of judgement and practice. To move from RED

to AMBER the RED marker must achieve 3 observations and 3 samples with no more than 1 action identified on each.

Band 2 – Amber

All markers deemed yellow should have a development plan in place to move them from amber to yellow.

The marker may move from amber to yellow when the following criteria have been achieved.

- The IV has sampled five assessments/portfolios and there have not been any remedial actions
- The development plan for the transition from amber to yellow has been achieved

A review every 6 weeks to include at least two observations of practice and sampling of decisions across a sample of learning outcomes. The basis of this will be decided by the IV based on previous practice and outcomes of monitoring. To move from AMBER to YELLOW AMBER IV must achieve 2 observations and 2 samples with no more than 1 future action on each.

Band 3 – Yellow

They may also have moved from amber due to recent successful sampling.

All markers deemed yellow should have a development plan in place to move them from yellow to green.

The marker The IV has sampled five assessments/portfolios and there have not been any remedial actions

- The development plan for the transition from amber to yellow has been achieved

A review every 12 weeks to include at least one observation of practice and sampling of decisions across a sample of learning outcomes. The basis of this will be decided by the IQA in their rationale based on previous practice and outcomes of monitoring. To move from YELLOW to GREEN the YELLOW marker must achieve 1 observation and 1 sample with no more than 1 future action on each.

Band 4 – Green

This marker is qualified and recent sampling has not shown any significant action points. A review every 6 months – sampling based on CPD objectives in the maker's training record and/or the team's standardisation or observation of practice if requested by the marker. To remain green, the marker must not incur more than 1 action on any sample. More than 1 action will move the green marker to AMBER.

Where markers are not qualified all decisions must be countersigned by a qualified mentor/countersigning marker.

Areas to be sampled

- Learners: across cohorts and programmes and where learning difficulties exist.
- Assessment Methods: to cover questioning, observations, worksheets, product evidence, RPL, professional discussion, guided discussion, assignments, case studies and projects.
- The Learning Process: delivery, recruitment, IAG, RPL, induction and training/learning.
- Records: records of assessment decisions, marker reports, marking, assignment and knowledge question marking, and feedback to learners.
- Where portfolios/coursework represents the assessment the IV must sample it a minimum of 3 times.

CPD of Markers

Where there is one, the Lead IV is responsible for identifying individual marker development needs and providing opportunities and resources to support them in achieving and implementing these to improve assessment/delivery practice overall, otherwise, this role is played by the Academic Development Lead, who receives and keeps all CPD records.

CPD activities for markers and tutors include:

- Peer observations
- IV observations

- Reading of books linked to national occupational standards
- Training courses – internal and external
- Update Training
- Standardisation training
- Self-assessment and evaluation against the NOS for markers
- One-to-one meeting for markers

Each member of the delivery/assessment team must receive at least a half-hour one-to-one meeting every trimester with the Academic Development Lead, this will enable EDA to implement support were necessary at the earliest opportunity.

The outcomes of this must be recorded and agreed upon in writing within a week of the meeting. These will be scheduled in advance and each marker is expected to bring their CPD records and Plans to the meeting.

Assessment and Awards Boards

The Assessment Panels is one of the Committee of the Academic Board. They consider the outcomes of the assessment and quality assurance processes. They decide whether to institute any changes to processes including changes in policy to ensure that processes continue to meet the requirements of the awarding partners and that the threshold standards of the courses offered continue to be consistent with the FHEQ framework.

The Boards also consider any conflicts that may have arisen during the standardization and internal verification processes, how they were resolved and make final decisions where resolution could not be reached. They identify training needs where necessary, considering comments on the internal verification for members of staff.

Assessment Panels consider issues affecting the student submissions such as extenuating circumstances.

Assessment Panel considers student achievement and analyses overall student performance both individually and in groups. This process also generates training needs for specific members of staff. It forms part of the Annual Review that EDA undertakes.

The Assessment Panels approve the results on student achievement. The business of Assessment Panels is confidential, and only after formal confirmation will marks and awards be made known to individual students. Assessment decisions are recorded electronically on the VLE, and results are emailed to students.

Full details on the Terms of Reference of Assessment Panels are contained in the Governance Document.

Assessment Panels are chaired by the Deputy Principal Academic as Head of the Academic Board.

Program and Module Leaders provide documents and reports submitted to the Assessment Panels. They attend Assessment Panels and present the summarized reports as well as any statistical analyses used at the Boards.

Teaching staff present reports on the submission and achievement trends within the classes they assessed.

Some awarding partners will have their Quality Assurance and claims processes. These should be followed.

Where applicable, the last Assessment Panel on each program should be an Awards Board. This should normally follow a successful External Examiner/Verifier/External Quality Assurance Review. The following guidelines apply to Awards Boards.

Awards and Certificate Claims

Principles

The College actively seeks to comply with all requirements of the relevant awarding bodies/organisations, through:

- ensuring that there are effective mechanisms for designing, approving, monitoring, and reviewing the assessment strategies for programmes and awards.
- implementing rigorous assessment policies and practices that ensure the standard for each award
- ensuring the award element is set and maintained at the appropriate level and that the learner's performance is properly judged against this
- publicising and implementing clear rules and regulations for progressing from one stage of a programme to another and for qualifying for an award
- The College references the relevant awarding organisation's regulations regarding learner achievement within a given programme.
- Learner progress is recorded by the Registry in the College database, and available to the learner, academic staff, and external examiners.
- Learner certificates should only be claimed after all relevant internal and external examiner processes have been completed and approval to certify the learners granted by the External Examiner/Verifier/External Quality Assurer
- An Awards Board should be convened to consider all learners and approve awards and the relevant grades and credits achieved
- Upon such approval, valid learner certificates should be claimed within one month of the designated end date of the programme for each learner.

Grades Awarded

Assessment grades will be awarded according to the requirements of the awarding partner. Standard grading systems include:

- PASS, MERIT, or DISTINCTION or Referral
- PASS only,
- Pass/Fail

Award Claims Process

- The Programme Leader confirms the list and grades of learners on the final tracking sheet and presents it to the Academic Development Lead for checking.
- The Academic Development Lead checks the tracking sheets and presents them at the next Awards Board.
- The Awards Board goes through each learner's details, confirming that the assessment processes were followed for each learner, and approves the grades and credits to be awarded.
- If required, these records should be available for scrutiny and final approval by the External Examiner
- The Registrar checks learner details and claims the Learners' certificates for all modules with at least a pass grade
- The Registrar should maintain details of all certificates received from the awarding body to ensure accuracy and completeness and then send the originals to the learners, keeping all copies of original certificates in the college safely
- These records should be kept safely and securely for three years post-certification.
- Awarding bodies/organisations may charge a fee for printing new certificates. In the event of any application for a reissue of a certificate due to errors, the Registrar should liaise with the Academic Development Lead and Deputy Principal Academic to determine who should cover the such payment. If it is the learner, such payment should be made to the Accounts Department before applying for a reissue of the certificate is made

External Examiner/Verifier/External Quality Assurance Review

Awarding partners will have their own rules for the allocation of External Examiners/Verifiers/External Quality Assurers (External Examiners). The awarding partners normally appoint their External Examiners.

External Examiners confirm that threshold standards are consistent with national qualifications frameworks and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those threshold standards have been met.

The role of the College is to facilitate the external examining processes and to ensure that any concerns raised by External Examiners are addressed and plans made for addressing these concerns are implemented.

Where the awarding partner requires, a Quality Nominee is appointed for the provision. Quality Nominees are normally the first point of contact with the External Examiners.

Every External Examiner report should be scrutinised and issues, concerns and areas of good practice identified. Action plans for addressing any concerns should be drafted and implemented.

Use of Other External Expertise

The Academic Board will, from time to time involve External Expertise in assessments to ensure that:

- the College is maintaining the threshold standards of its programmes on behalf of its awarding partners
- threshold standards are enforced (particularly where PSRBs are available)

These can be subject specialists or staff members from a partner organisation to provide peer reviews for staff.

Where possible, specialists from awarding partners and PSRBs may be invited to offer training and guidance on assessment practices.

The College has an External Advisor to the Academic Board, who is responsible for Quality Assurance. The External Advisor advises the Academic Board on various issues including

quality assurance of assessment practices. The external Advisor can at any time take samples of assessment instruments or student work at any stage of the assessment process to check that assessment standards are maintained.

Student Involvement

Student representatives should receive the generalised sections of the External Examiner reports. They should participate in the discussions on External Examiner Reports at Program Boards, where they should participate in drafting action plans and monitoring the implementation of the action plans.

All students must receive comments from External Examiner reports during the Student Staff Liaison meetings.