Code of Practice

Higher Education Assessment

Review

Formal Review Cycle	Every 3 years (or earlier due to changes in regulation)		
Latest Formal Review (date)	May 2025	Next Formal Review Due (date)	May 2028
Policy Owner	Associate Principal for Teaching, Learning and Quality		
Policy Author	Associate Principal for Teaching, Learning and Quality		

Approvals

Board of Corp Y/N		Committee		Date Board approved	08/05/25
ELT Y/N	Y	ELT date approved	20/06/24	Additional committee	HE Board

Publication

Website Y/N	Y	Unify Y/N	Y	Student VLE Y/N	Y	Other	

Change History

Version	Date Reviewed/ Revised	Description of Change	Reviewed by	Approved by
1.0	24 May 2024	New Code of Practice for HE Assessment		HE Board
1.1	24 April 2025	Minor amendments to format Change of body to organisation Change of author Insertion of resubmission regulations from awarding organisations section 14 and each appendix	C Stretesky	HE Board (08/05/25)

Higher Education Assessment

1. **This Code of Practice (CoP):**

1.1.   Pertains to City of Sunderland College, trading as Education Partnership North East (which includes Sunderland College, Hartlepool Sixth Form College and Northumberland   College). These colleges will be referred to as "the College" throughout this document.

2. **Scope**

2.1. The CoP applies to all staff and students who are associated with any Higher Education programme of the College.
2.2. This CoP applies to all assessments undertaken in association with any Higer Education programme of the College.

3. **Aims of the Code.**

3.1   The CoP makes clear the expectations of the College regarding setting of assessment and the completion and marking of assessment tasks.

3.2   The code is mindful of the regulations specified by partner universities, or other awarding organisations, who are in most instances the final arbitrator of quality and standards for their awards. Specific requirements of the awarding organisations are provided in the appendices.

3.3 The code brings together a range of processes relating to assessment including:
   i.   Information staff will give to students about the assessments at the beginning and during a module;
   ii. What students must do to meet the assessment requirements, and the consequences should these not be completed;
   iii. What reasonable adjustments to examination and assessment arrangements may be made to enable students with disabilities to demonstrate their abilities in accordance with the Equality Act 2010;
   iv. How the college will ensure academic standards are maintained through assessment practice, ensuring assessment is carried out by competent and impartial markers using methods that enable rigor, probity and fairness.

4. **Underpinning Principles of assessment:**

4.1   Methods and criteria are aligned to learning outcomes.
4.2   Is reliable, consistent and valid.
4.3   Design is approached holistically.
4.4   Is inclusive and equitable.
4.5   Is explicit and transparent.
4.6   Feedback is purposeful and supports the learning process.
4.7   Is timely.
4.8   Is efficient and manageable.
4.9   Encourages academic integrity
4.10   Students are supported and prepared for assessment.

5.   **Terminology**

5.1   **Must:** Indicates an action is an essential duty or is considered a necessity.

5.2   **Should:** Indicates the action is considered favourable but is not essential.

5.3   **Threshold academic standards**: The minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student must demonstrate to be eligible for the award of academic credit or a qualification. For equivalent qualifications, the threshold level of achievement is agreed across the UK.

5.4   **Academic standards:** The standards that individual degree-awarding bodies set and maintain for the award of their academic credit or qualifications. These may exceed the threshold academic standards. They include the standards of performance that a student needs to demonstrate to achieve a particular classification of a qualification, such as a first-class honours degree classification in a certain subject or the award of merit or distinction in a foundation degree.

5.5   **Academic quality**: How, and how well, the higher education provider supports students to enable them to achieve their award. It covers learning, teaching and assessment, and all the different resources and processes a provider puts in place to help students progress and fulfil their potential.

5.6   **Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ):** sets out general expectations about the academic standards of higher education awards at various levels. It provides an important reference point for institutions, staff and students in the development of academic awards, and in particular for the development of intended learning outcomes for programmes of study. When used together with subject benchmark statements and programme specifications, the FHEQ helps to provide confidence that the academic standards of awards are comparable with those of other awards at the same level, both in the same and in other institutions.

5.7   **The UK Quality Code for Higher Education:** The nationally agreed, definitive point of reference for all those who deliver or support UK higher education programmes. It sets out 12 sector agreed principles that all UK higher education providers should meet.

5.8   **The Office for Students (OfS) Regulatory Framework:** The framework governing institutions delivering higher education in England. The framework outlines the OfS expectations in relation to quality and standards of assessment.

5.9   **Credit:** A means of quantifying and recognising learning whenever and wherever it is achieved. Credit is awarded in recognition of achievement of learning outcomes at a specified level.

5.10   **Module**: A self-contained, formally structured unit of study, with a coherent and explicit set of learning outcomes and assessment criteria. For non-university higher education qualifications, these are often referred to as units. A module will equate to an overall number of credits.

5.11   **Module Learning Outcome:** A learning outcome is the specification of what a student should learn as the result of a period of specified and supported study. Learning outcomes are concerned with the achievements of the student rather than the intentions of the teacher (expressed in the aims of a module).

5.12   **Validation Document**: The approved validation document sets out all elements of the programme of study, including all details of learning outcomes or assessments. For non-university programmes this is known as an Award Specification.

5.13   **Module Handbook:** The module handbook publishes all details about a module at the point that teaching starts for that module.

5.14   **Assessment Task Proforma (ATP):** the proforma used for setting out the module assessment in a standardised format.

5.15   **Programme Handbook**: The programme handbook summarises key regulations which will be followed during study and how students will be supported in their study. It includes the validation document for the students.

5.16   **Formative assessment:** Assessment with a developmental purpose, designed to help students learn more effectively by giving them feedback on their performance and how it can be improved and/or maintained. Reflective practice by students sometimes contributes to formative assessment.

5.17   **Summative assessment:** Used to indicate the extent of a student's success in meeting the assessment criteria to gauge the intended learning outcomes of a module or programme. Typically, within summative assessment, the marks awarded count towards the final mark of the course/module/award.

5.18   **Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs):** These are completed by students on an MEQ template approved by Education Partnership North East Quality Office. They should be issued by the relevant Programme/Module Leader and feedback analysed for inclusion in subsequent module handbooks.

5.19   **Lecturer**: Member of staff who teaches on a HE programme who has approved Recognised Teacher Status (RTS)

6.   Before Delivery Commences

6.1   Programme design is completed following the quality framework of partner/ university regulations and within the context of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

6.2   The design of programmes ensures that assessment tasks are in line with;

  i.   Threshold standards associated with areas of study;
  ii. Benchmark statements;
  iii. Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ).

6.3   Module tutors must design assessment tasks to reflect those stated within the validation document and a system of moderation must be conducted.

6.4   Module tutors must complete the Assessment Task Proforma (ATP), or awarding organisation equivalent, and a Module Handbook using the latest template approved by Education Partnership North East Quality Office.

6.5   The completed ATP must progress through internal moderation by an approved higher education Programme Leader or above, with RTS standing.

6.6   Module Handbooks containing the moderated Assessment Task must be checked by the relevant Programme Leader for accuracy. Checking of the module handbook must include checks on:

  i.   Use of the correct validation document and latest module handbook template.
  ii. Assessment terminology is appropriate to the FHEQ level (if the assessment has not yet progressed to assessment moderation).
  iii. Assessment task and description are clearly aligned to those validated for the module and programme (if the assessment has not yet progressed to assessment moderation).

    iv. Previous student feedback has been completed at the end of the handbook and a Module Evaluation Questionnaire included.

    v. A full assessment schedule with clear deadlines for submission and for return of feedback to students.

6.7   For programmes validated by the University of Hull, the ATP and module handbook must be sent to the relevant Academic Contact of the programme for approval. The External Examiner will also have access to any summative assessment for review prior to issue to students. Further information can be accessed in the University of Hull Quality and Standards Handbook.

6.8   In all cases, the ATP and module handbook, following any awarding organisation internal moderation, must be made available to the External Examiner through the recognised method for the relevant awarding organisation.

6.9   For non-university programmes, prior approval may be required from the awarding organisation for module design and assessment plans.

6.10   Module tutors must provide students with clear and precise information about the means through which they will be assessed in each module.

6.11   At the start of each module, students will be provided with a module handbook that will describe the precise requirements of the assessment. This will include:

    i. The nature and dates of the summative assessment to be carried out by the student e.g. case study, report, presentation etc. in order to achieve the module;

    ii. The nature and dates of the formative assessments to be completed by the student;

    iii. The assessment title or brief, or a clear date that this will be released if appropriate;

    iv. Which learning outcomes are expected to be met for each summative assessment task;

    v. The assessment tariff (word count) for each assessment;

    vi. The assessment weighting e.g. what percentage of the grade awarded for the assessment will contribute to the overall mark of the module;

    vii. The assessment grading criteria;

    viii. How to submit work/coversheet if appropriate;

    ix. The methods used to provide assessment feedback.

6.12   Students should note that the information provided about assessment is defined, approved and governed by the awarding organisation through which their programme of study is validated. For example, assessment type, tariff and weighting are classified by the respective awarding organisation's assessment regulations.

6.13   For delivery on all awards, all deadlines should be signed off at the beginning of each academic year. Once delivery commences on a module it is not possible for deadlines to be moved without the prior approval of the relevant senior manager (or equivalent).   Initial discussion should take place with the Quality Office.

7.   Assessment of Students

Conflict of Interest in Delivery and Assessment

7.1   For all higher education awards at Education Partnership North East, regardless of awarding organisation, there should be an avoidance of conflicts of interest between the programme / module tutors and students.

7.2 Where lecturers are related to students (by birth or through marriage/civil partnership), those persons must not be responsible for delivery to that student or be involved in the marking or assessment moderation process. Where a perceived conflict of interest arises the lecturer must notify curriculum leadership immediately.

7.3 It is the responsibility of curriculum leadership to manage Programme Leader/staffing allocation accordingly before delivery commences on a module.

7.4 For all higher education awards regardless of awarding organisation, where there is an unavoidable conflict of interest between work colleagues (for example, an Education tutor takes a teacher education course), there must be an independent second marker in the assessment process for those students.

8. Assessment Processes During Delivery

8.1 Assessment occurs during all delivery and is a normal part of the teaching and learning process. It occurs spontaneously during delivery, through question and answer and in planned activities by lecturers in group activities or online submissions. These assessment activities only contribute to grades where this is made clear in the module handbook. Activities and informal assessment are used to help the students develop understanding for their formative and summative assessment tasks.

8.2 Formal formative assessment occurs in every module and for every assessment. This formative opportunity is designed with fairness in mind, giving every student an opportunity for equitable feedback on an activity, normally associated with their summative assessment work.

8.3 The module handbook must state the nature of the formal formative assessment and when and how this will occur. Failure to prepare adequately for the published formative feedback date will mean that students miss this opportunity for this source of feedback.

8.4 Formal formative feedback must be developmental and allow the student to improve their work in order to increase their grade or understanding of the subject. It is unlikely to give guarantee of a grade. The feedback must be documented in a way to ensure there is adequate evidence of how the grade has been arrived at.

8.5 Students must adhere to all deadlines set out in module handbooks which are published on the module Teams Page.

8.6 Students must submit their work via Teams. This applies for all forms of assessment. For assessment activities which cannot be submitted via Teams, a cover sheet must be uploaded so that feedback can be given.

8.7 If a student finds difficulty in submitting to Teams due to technical issues they must email a copy of their work to programme leader before the deadline, copying in their module leader. The student must then continue to attempt to submit the work via Teams. The Teams submission will be checked against their final submission to ensure no advantage has been gained.

9. Marking of Assessments

9.1   Assessments should be marked and have been internally moderated within the following timescales:

Awarding/Validating Body	Working Days
University of Hull	20
Cumbria University	20
Pearson	15
NCFE	15

9.2   Feedback must be given to the group within the timelines outlined in 9.1 or an explanation provided to the group via email.

9.3   All students who submitted work by the same deadline for that assessment must be given access to feedback simultaneously. Feedback remains subject to change following external moderation.

9.4   Where practical, all summative assessments should be marked with respect to anonymity. Exceptions to this must be approved by the Faculty Director and reported to Quality on an annual basis.

9.5   Students can expect in every instance timely feedback on assessed work to ensure that they are able to use feedback to inform other assessments. For example, receiving feedback on academic and study skills performance can help a student make informed changes in subsequent work.

9.6   The grades given as part of feedback are provisional until the Board of Examiners has ratified the decisions. The final grades are usually communicated to students via their Notification of Progress or Transcript. These are usually provided in March, June and September following the boards.

9.7   Written feedback to students must include an indication of whether the assessed learning outcomes have been achieved or not achieved. The learning outcomes must be detailed fully on the assessment feedback. It is not sufficient to merely refer the students to the learning outcomes in their module handbook.

9.8   Where learning outcomes have not been achieved, written lecturer feedback must provide a clear explanation and offer ways to meet the learning outcomes through resit/reassessment.

9.9   Feedback must refer to the strengths and weaknesses of the submission and include actions for the future. Actions for future development should consider:

     x. General academic features such as study skills / referencing
    xi. Presentation, style, structure;
   xii. Criticality;
  xiii. Focus on the question/ establishment of a key and relevant question;
  xiv. Artistic merit or answer to a brief;
   xv. Whether it meets professional standards set by a professional body.
  xvi. Spelling, punctuation and grammar.

9.10   A grade must be given in line with the descriptor that best matches the Undergraduate General Marking Criteria provided within the Module Handbook Template or, where appropriate, in relation to the grading criteria suggested by the awarding organisation.

9.11   Records of candidate assessment will be kept for a minimum of 5 years after the completion of the qualification. Where there has been an internal appeal, academic misconduct investigation or other investigation requiring the retention of assessment data, this will be stored securely for 6 years.

9.12   Programme teams are to store electronic copies of assessments in SharePoint. For live assessments or artefacts that are not electronic, records of the assessment must be produced and kept

10.   Assessment of Students with Disability

10.1   Reasonable adjustments to examination and assessment arrangements may be made to enable students with disabilities to demonstrate their abilities. This should not change the mode of the assessment, but adjustments may be made to the method of completion.

10.3   The person responsible for the assessment must consider appropriately the needs of any student with a particular health or other problem.

10.4   Students with alternative needs are assessed through the Inclusive Learning team, and changes to the arrangements of assessments for these students must only be made on their advice. This applies equally to summative and formative assessments.

10.5   Where a change of format of assessment is requested such as coursework in place of an exam or splitting an exam into 2 sessions, this request must be agreed with the relevant senior leader prior to seeking approval from the awarding organisation.

11.   Over Length Assignments and Word Counts

11.1   Regulations are followed as specified by the awarding organisation, the rules are published in each year's programme handbook.

11.2   Word counts exclude (unless otherwise stated) footnotes, reference lists, bibliographies, diagrams, appendices, graphs, charts, tables and other similar features.

11.3   Students are required to declare the word count on the first page of their assignment.

11.4   An erroneous word count declaration will be dealt with as suspected use of unfair means.

12.   Failure to submit and late submissions

12.1   Regulations are followed as specified by the awarding organisation as outlined in the programme handbook.

12.2   Penalties must not include public holidays. When setting deadlines public holidays should be considered to minimise student manipulation of penalties.

12.3   When the work is marked students will be given the actual mark and then a clear indication of why a penalty has been applied, followed by the modified result.

13.   Second Marking and Moderation

13.1   Moderation is the process whereby a student's numerical score (or categorisation of result) is checked and validated by a second assessor and that there is confirmation that comments given and feedback

are developmental and accurate. The specific expectations of each awarding organisation are outlined in the relevant appendix.

13.2   Moderation must be completed on a Moderation Proforma. Where an awarding organisation does not have this, a Moderation Proforma approved by the Quality Office of Education Partnership North East must be used.

13.3   Second Marking is the process by which some assessments are fully marked independently by another academic member of staff.

13.4   All staff marking dissertations or equivalent projects involving 40 credits or more at undergraduate level must follow the principle of concealed second marking. Concealed second marking is a process whereby a second person or persons, without sight of the first markers comments or feedback, marks the work and allocates a mark and provides comment.

13.5   It is acknowledged that for some project equivalents it is not appropriate to operate this principle and in such a circumstance the Curriculum Manager and programme team must agree an alternative approach. Any alternative approaches should be discussed with the Quality Office.

13.6   All presentations or live performances must be second marked. It is considered good practice that first and second markers observing performances or presentations sit separately within the performance/ assessment venue and mark independently from one another on feedback sheets, subsequently evidencing on a Moderation Proforma how the final and agreed grade is reached.

13.7   All non-university moderation is conducted using the double marking principle.

13.8   Whole group moderation can occur under two conditions:

- The first is if this is required by the RTS status of the tutor,
- or when issues of concern have been identified about the competency of a first marker.

It is the responsibility of the Curriculum Manager (or equivalent) to make clear which module(s) will warrant 'whole group' moderation.

13.9   External Moderation refers to the process through which an independent other such as the External Examiner or academic tutor from a partner Higher Education Institution will sample all or a percentage of the assessments from a student group.

13.10   Programme teams should operate the system as defined by the relevant awarding organisation in such instances.

14.   Resubmission or reassessment

14.1   Awarding organisation regulations for resubmission or reassessment must be followed at all times and be published in the programme handbook

14.2   Academic regulations for each awarding organisation is found in appendix 1 – 3 the following key points are common amongst each:

14.2   Students whose first submission does not meet the minimum requirements for an assessment must be given the opportunity to resubmit/ reassess

14.3   Board of examiners delegate responsibility to the curriculum leadership to authorise resubmissions

14.4   Resubmissions or reassessments must be recorded on the relevant assessment documentation, module grids and reported in the Board of Examiners

14. Associated Documents

- Academic Appeals Policy
- Academic Misconduct Policy
- Mitigating Circumstances Code of Practice
- Board of Examiners Code of Practice

15. Policy Monitoring and Review

The HE Board will keep the code under regular review and report annually to ELT on the implementation of the code.

16. Equality Impact Assessment

Have you sought consultation on this policy? Details:		HE Board, Programme Leaders and HE Coordinators meeting.		
Could a particular group be affected (negatively or positively)?	Impact Y/N	Description of Impact	Evidence	Mitigation/ Justification
Protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010				
Age	N			
Disability	N			
Gender Reassignment	N			
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N			
Pregnancy and maternity	N			
Race	N			
Religion or belief	N			
Sex	N			
Sexual Orientation	N			
Additional characteristics to consider				
Young Persons in Care & Care Leavers	N			
Young Carers & Care Givers	N			
Young Parents	N			
Youth Offenders	N			
Those Receiving Free School Meals	N			

If there is no impact, please explain:	

Appendix 1: University of Hull

Further information can be accessed through the University of Hull Quality and Standards Handbook:

[Quality and Standards | University of Hull](#)

Code of Practice: Assessment Procedures: [ucop-assessment-procedures-v1-22-may-2024-for-sept-2024.docx (live.com)](#)

1. **Marking of Assessments**
    a. All assessments should be marked and internally moderated within 20 working days.

2. **Over Length Assignments and Word Counts**
    a. The University of Hull does not specify specific penalties but will not mark beyond the stipulated assessment length.
    b. Further information can be accessed at: [ucop-assessment-procedures-v1-21-lt.docx (live.com)](#) – Section 7.

3. **Failure to submit and late submissions**
    a. Following failure to attend an examination or submit a piece of assessed work without receiving the approval of the Additional Consideration Committee, a mark of zero must be recorded for that examination/piece of assessed work.
    b. Where work is submitted outside of the stipulated late period (greater than 5 working days late) it should not be marked and a mark of zero must be awarded.
    c. Where work is submitted within the stipulated late period (up to and including 5 working days late) the following penalties must be adhered to:
        i. Penalties are a percentage of the maximum mark available for the assessment component which has been submitted late.
        ii. All coursework assessments must have a published submission time which should be no earlier than 10am and no later than 4pm, and on Mondays to Thursdays inclusive, and this submission time must be communicated effectively to students.
    d. The late submission penalties which must be applied to coursework submitted after the published deadline are:
        i. Up to and including 24 hours after the deadline, a penalty of 10% or the mark is reduced to the pass mark, whichever results in the higher mark.
        ii. More than 24 hours and up to and including 5 working days after the deadline the mark awarded is reduced to the pass mark.
    e. Where work is submitted outside of the stipulated late period (greater than 5 working days late) it should not be marked and a mark of zero awarded.

4. **Second Marking and Moderation**
    a. Summative examinations and coursework that contribute to the overall degree classification are subject to internal second marking/moderation, extended to all levels for those with no previous marking experience
    b. An appropriate member of academic staff must undertake all second marking within a module.
    c. For assessment tasks that contribute 70% or more to a module equal to or greater than 30 credits, second marking must be undertaken.
    d. Where marks agree (within a 10% margin) then either:
        i. a final grade is agreed through discussion between the 2 markers, or
        ii. an average of the two marks awarded is taken.

e. Where there is a greater than 10% discrepancy in marks, a third marker must be employed.
f. Clear records of any discussions and final mark.
g. Second marking of 'live' assessment. Where an assessment is conducted 'live' e.g., presentations, performance, competency checking etc. a provision for internal moderation must be made where the task accounts for >10% of the module overall assessment burden. This may involve having two or more markers present or the use of video recorders if appropriate. In all cases, first and second markers should arrive at a mark independently in the first instance and agree a final mark following discussion.
h. An appropriate member of academic staff must undertake all internal second moderation within a module.
i. The moderator samples work carried out by the marker and will have access to all grades and associated feedback. In this form of moderation, the role of the moderator is to check for consistency, accuracy and correct use of specific grading criteria/mark schemes. When carrying out this form of moderation it is expected that no less than 10% (or 10 pieces whichever is the higher) of all assessed work is reviewed and must include:
    i. All fails,
    ii. A representative number from across the full range of marks awarded,
    iii. Any falling just below a grade boundary (e.g., 49, 59, 69),
    iv. The sample must be increased to 20% (or 20 pieces whichever is the higher) in the case of a new mode of assessment* or where the marker is inexperienced (not previously marked at the level),
    v. In those instances, where more than one person has carried out the initial marking process, at least 10% or 5 pieces of work must be included from each marker involved in the process.
    vi. If the moderator is assured the marking process meets the expectation set out above, the first mark will stand.

5. Reassessment
    a. Students shall always be given an opportunity to undertake reassessment in modules in which they have not achieved a weighted average mark of at least 40 in levels 3, 4, 5 and 6.
    b. Where a student does not achieve the weighted average mark that is required to secure a pass in a module and cannot be considered for compensation or condonement, they must only be reassessed in those components of assessment which they have failed, except where the programme/module specification specifically prescribes otherwise.
    c. Reassessment should be by resubmission of the original work, modified to demonstrate achievement of the failed learning outcomes/competencies. Exceptionally, reassessment may be by submission of a new piece of work.
    d. Refer to the relevant University Programme Regulations for clarification of reassessment procedures

Appendix 2 - University of Cumbria

Further detailed information can be accessed through the University of Cumbria's Assessment Regulations:

Academic-Regulations.pdf

Procedures Governing the Marking and Moderation of Assessments: Appendix 3b (cumbria.ac.uk)

The Conduct of Assessment: Appendix 3c (cumbria.ac.uk)

1. **Marking of Assessments**
   a. All assessments should be marked and internally moderated within 20 working days.
2. **Over Length Assignments and Word Counts**

Word count exceeded by:	Penalty to be applied to the assessment item
0-10%	No penalty
Over 10% to30%	10 marks deducted (from assessment item) or pass mark awarded (whichever it the highest)
Over 30% +	Maximum mark awarded is a pass mark

Additional information can be found at: Appendix 3c (cumbria.ac.uk) Section 3.5.1

3. **Failure to submit and late submissions**
   a. Work submitted beyond the submission date but within 3 working days (ie excluding weekends, public holidays and periods of University closure only) will be accepted as an unauthorised late submission. The maximum mark that can be awarded will be the pass mark (40% Levels 3-6; 50% Level 7(M)). Tutorial support for the subject should not be available during this period but Learning Support will continue to be available (Academic Regulation F6.2) as will Technical Support especially in regard to facilities and health and safety.
   b. Unauthorised late submission applies only to the first assessment of coursework, and not to authorised extensions, deferred assessment or reassessment. It also does not apply to timed assessments such as presentations, group work, exhibitions or performances, which have the status of examinations.
   c. Work submitted beyond 3 working days (ie excluding weekends, public holidays and periods of University closure only) after the submission date will be regarded as non-submission and awarded zero (Academic Regulation F6.2).
   d. Authorised extensions to submission may be agreed by the module or nominated tutor for valid reasons, on application by the student through Institutional procedures. An extension may normally be given for up to 2 weeks (14 days including 10 working days). Extensions beyond 2 weeks may only be given in exceptional circumstances. Deadlines for extensions must allow time for internal and external moderation before the designated Module Confirmation Board. No penalty will be applied to the mark where an extension is approved, provided the work is submitted to the re-negotiated deadline.
   e. Where known extenuating circumstances, approved by the EC Panel, prevent the student from submitting by the due date, the University Progression and Award Board may offer to void or waive the assessment (see, Appendix 3e, 6.2.1).

4. Second Marking and Moderation

a. All credit bearing assessment (except dissertations and theses of 20 credits or more which are subject to blind double marking), is subject to moderation. The moderator is provided with the assessment criteria and marking scheme and has access to full set of coursework or examination scripts from which he/she selects a representative sample. The moderator may have sight of the feedback, annotated comments, and the mark awarded by the first marker

b. Moderation is based on a representative sample equal to the square root of n (n) where n is the number of students in the module delivery group to a minimum of five items, plus all failed pieces. Where the number of failed items exceeds 3, the moderator may limit moderation to a representative sample of at least 3 of the failed items. The representative sample should include one script from each grade band. Where a module is delivered at different locations, each delivery group must be sampled, including groups based at collaborative partners.

5. Reassessment

a. Unless prohibited by professional statutory and regulatory body regulations, undergraduate and postgraduate students have a right to one reassessment opportunity for any failed component of assessment in each module.

b. Reassessment is required in the area of failure only and will be by a method appropriate to the nature of the validated assessment scheme for the module as determined by the Module Confirmation Board. Where it is not practicable for a student to be reassessed using the original method or mode of assessment, the Module Confirmation Board may approve an alternative method or timescale.

An assessment contract should be drawn up in the following cases

• Students with more than 40 credits of assessed work to be recouped (first reassessment and deferred assessment);

• Students who have had a confirmed case of malpractice that has resulted in reassessment.

c. Where the student passes all reassessment elements, credit for the module(s) is awarded. The pass mark is recorded for any module in which reassessment has been successful (a maximum of 40% for undergraduate and a maximum of 50% for postgraduate). For programmes which involve PSRB accreditation, the pass mark will be 'capped' at the PSRB pass mark.

d. Where the student fails to improve on the original assessment performance via reassessment, the final mark for the module will be the highest mark obtained.

e. A student who fails their reassessment may be considered for compensation in that module within the limits outlined in F14.1 Cumbria Academic regulations.

Appendix 3 - Pearson

Further detail can be accessed through Pearson

[BTEC Higher Nationals Centre Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment (2024-2025)](#)

1. **Marking of Assessments**
   a. All assessments should be marked and internally moderated within 15 working days.

2. **Over Length Assignments and Word Counts**
   a. Where written evidence is required, a word count may be included to direct the student about the volume of evidence required. Students cannot be downgraded if they do not achieve or exceed the word count. Their performance in the assignment is based on achievement of the relevant learning outcomes.

3. **Failure to submit and late submissions**
   a. On Higher National Programmes in instances when no extension has been granted, or there is not sufficiently good cause for work being submitted late (such as when mitigating circumstances have been granted), then the following penalties will apply:

   i. Any assessment which has been submitted after the published deadline without a previously approved extension request will be classed as late. For example, where the deadline is 12pm, any piece of work submitted at 12.01pm will be considered late.
   ii. Any assessment submitted within 7 calendar days of the deadline will be marked but the work capped at a Pass grade.
   iii. Any assessment submitted after 7 calendar days will be classed as a non-submission and a re-assessment will be required.
   iv. In cases where an extension request has been approved and the deadline is subsequently not met the assessment will be considered as late and a re-assessment will be required.
   v. Re-assessment attempts will be capped at Pass grade.

4. **Second Marking and Moderation**
   a. The number of scripts is decided using the following principles for Pearson provision:
      i. All fails, borderlines and firsts must be moderated;
      ii. 10 scripts/ assessments or 10% of the whole group (whichever is the largest) must be moderated;
   b. At the time of moderation, the second assessor should have access to the full list of results for the student group i.e. it is not sufficient for a first marker to merely give the second assessor a sample of work without the second assessor seeing the list of marks awarded for all students in the group;
   c. The documentation of moderation should demonstrate that there has been discussion between the first and second marker particularly where disagreement between both markers has manifested.
5. Resubmission (RQF qualifications)
   a. one resubmission is allowed if a student does not achieve a pass on first submission.
   b. the reassessment opportunity will be capped at pass for that unit.
   c. A student will not be entitled to be reassessed in any component for which a pass or higher has already been awarded.
   d. Reassessment for course work, project or portfolio-based assessments shall normally involve the reworking of the original activity
   e. For examinations, reassessment shall involve completion of a new activity

Appendix 3 - NCFE

Further detail can be accessed through NCFE

qa-policy-for-awarding-for-2024-25.pdf

1. **Marking of Assessments**
   a. All assessments should be marked and internally moderated within 15 working days.

2. **Over Length Assignments and Word Counts**
   a. Where written evidence is required, a word count may be included to direct the student about the volume of evidence required. Students cannot be downgraded if they do not achieve or exceed the word count. Their performance in the assignment is based on achievement of the relevant learning outcomes.

3. **Failure to submit and late submissions**
   a. On NCFE Programmes in instances when no extension has been granted, or there is not sufficiently good cause for work being submitted late (such as when mitigating circumstances have been granted), then the following penalties will apply:

      i. Any assessment which has been submitted after the published deadline without a previously approved extension request will be classed as late. For example, where the deadline is 12pm, any piece of work submitted at 12.01pm will be considered late.
      ii. Any assessment submitted within 7 calendar days of the deadline will be marked but the work capped at a Pass grade.
      iii. Any assessment submitted after 7 calendar days will be classed as a non-submission and a re-assessment will be required.
      iv. In cases where an extension request has been approved and the deadline is subsequently not met the assessment will be considered as late and a re-assessment will be required.
      v. Re-assessment attempts will be capped at Pass grade.

4. **Moderation**
   a. The number of scripts is decided using the following principles for NCFE provision:
      iii. All fails and borderlines must be moderated;
      iv. 10 scripts/ assessments or 10% of the whole group (whichever is the largest) must be moderated;
   b. At the time of moderation, the second assessor should have access to the full list of results for the student group i.e. it is not sufficient for a first marker to merely give the second assessor a sample of work without the second assessor seeing the list of marks awarded for all students in the group;
   c. The documentation of moderation should demonstrate that there has been discussion between the first and second marker particularly where disagreement between both markers has manifested.

5. Resubmission
   a. one resubmission is allowed if a student does not achieve a pass on first submission.
   b. the reassessment opportunity will be capped at pass for that unit.
   c. A student will not be entitled to be reassessed in any component for which a pass or higher has already been awarded.
   d. Reassessment for course work, project or portfolio-based assessments shall normally involve the reworking of the original activity
   e. For examinations, reassessment shall involve completion of a new activity