Futureworks

Version Control Statement

ID Number:		Document Name:	Assessment Policy & Procedure V1.2.2	
Approving Committee:	Academic Board			
Last Review:	N/A	Next Review:	Jun-Aug 2027	
Owner:	Academic Registrar	Review Lead:	Academic Registrar	
Amendments Since Approval:	Detail of Revision:		Date of Revision:	Revision Approved by:
	Updated in line with feedback from expert reader as part of institutional validation		04/02/2026	Academic Board
	Correction to number of Pro-Tools summative assessments (section 13). Correction of job title from Head of Academic Quality to Academic Registrar (section 15)		25/06/2026	Academic Board
	Roles updated in line with changes in management structure		13/08/2026	Academic Board

If this document is required in an alternative format, please contact Futureworks on 0161 214 4600 or via email: info@futureworks.ac.uk

Futureworks

Assessment Policy

Contents

1 Introduction 3

2 Scope 3

3 Assessment Principles 4

4 Grading Criteria & Grade Bands 5

5 Verification 6

6 Assessment Information & Scheduling 7

7 Assessment Literacy 7

8 Reasonable Adjustments 8

9 Coursework Submission Requirements 8

10 Late Submissions 9

11 Practical Assessments & Presentations 9

12 Group Work Guidelines 10

13 Exams 12

14 Marking 12

15 Moderation Process 13

16 Preparation for Assessment Boards 17

17 Assessment Boards 17

18 Retention of Assessed Work 18

19 Staff Development & Training 18

20 Other Relevant Policies & Procedures 18

21 Assessment Procedure 20

1 Introduction

1.1 Futureworks recognises the vital role of assessment practices and procedures in student success as defined by Advance HE:

"Assessment is an essential part of education. Robust assessment processes are critical for a rigorous evaluation of the level of student learning. Beyond judgement, the modes of assessment we select will shape not just what, but how students learn. Empowering and engaging learners through assessment design and providing opportunities for dialogic feedback is central to learning and the student experience." (Advance HE).

1.2 This document was produced with consideration of the assessment practices and procedures of other similar providers and with reference to the following key sources:

1.2.1 Advance HE Framework for Enhancing Assessment (2024)

1.2.2 Futureworks Learning, Teaching & Assessment Strategy

1.2.3 Futureworks Guidance on the Use of AI Tools in Assessment for Students

1.2.4 OfS Conditions of Registration

1.2.5 UK Quality Code of Higher Education (2024)

2 Scope

2.1 The Assessment Policy & Procedure sets out our key principles of assessment and is designed to act as a practical guide to assist students and staff engaged in the assessment of students at Futureworks.

2.2 It is intended to act as a key reference document for all Schools, which complements the specific assessment strategies implemented by individual programmes. It should be read in conjunction with the Regulations for Validated Awards of the Open University, in which the regulations governing assessment are set out.

3 Assessment Principles

3.1 Assessments should be valid, designed to explicitly test learning outcomes and should enable students to achieve and exceed the standard required for the award they seek (see the UK Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)).

3.2 There should be alignment between the curriculum being delivered, the assessment, and the grading criteria, to ensure that students are being fairly assessed against the intended learning outcomes.

3.3 The Futureworks Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy should guide assessment design and development.

3.4 Assessments should be authentic and relate to real-world scenarios.

3.5 Assessment methods should be inclusive, non-discriminatory and transparent in order to minimise the need for reasonable adjustments. Where reasonable adjustments are required assessment methods should be suitably flexible to enable this without compromising academic standards.

3.6 Student feedback should be considered in the design of programme assessment strategy and of individual assessments.

3.7 An appropriate range of assessment methods should be used, with opportunities for students to learn how to develop the necessary skills to succeed in those methods.

3.8 Programme teams should take a holistic view across the whole programme when planning an appropriate and manageable diet and timing of assessment.

3.9 Assessments should be designed to reduce opportunities for academic misconduct and to encourage academic integrity.

3.10 The permitted use of AI in assessment should be clearly articulated in each assessment brief and should conform with Futureworks' Guidance on the Use of AI Tools in Assessment for Students.

3.11 Assessments should be regularly reviewed and enhanced through continuous monitoring processes, in consultation with a range of stakeholders.

3.12 The quantity and timing of assessments should ensure the evaluation of intended learning outcomes and facilitate the effective measurement of student achievement.

3.13 Students should understand the grading criteria and the requirements of the assessment before it takes place.

3.14 Student work should be formatively assessed or evaluated in preparation for summative assessment, so that both feedback and feedforward can be provided in timely manner to support their learning.

3.15 Feedback should be engaging and constructive, enabling students to understand their grades in relation to the grading criteria and specifically how they can improve.

3.16 There should be a range of opportunities for students to engage with feedback and time should be built into their learning journey to reflect and use feedback to improve.

4 Grading Criteria & Grade Bands

4.1 For clarity the terms ‘mark’ and ‘grade’ are largely interchangeable at Futureworks, however, for the purpose of this document, marking is the process during which marks are recorded and the term grade is applied once agreement has been reached through the moderation process (see below) e.g. a first and second marker will discuss marks to arrive at an agreed grade

4.2 Grading criteria are used to judge the standard of student work. Where possible criteria specific to individual assessments, which have been derived from more generic grading criteria, are employed; however, the minimum expectation is the use of grading criteria relating to the type of assessment. These will be included in Module Handbooks and reviewed regularly to ensure that they are being applied consistently and transparently.

4.3 Verbs associated with Bloom’s taxonomy should be used for the wording of learning outcomes (e.g. apply, analyse, evaluate, create) and a corresponding set of adjectives should be used to define / differentiate the level of performance across a level. These are distinctive and applicable to different types of assessment activity and used in conjunction with terms that represent a ‘gradation of excellence’ e.g. ‘excellent, very good, good’.

4.4 All undergraduate assessment will be marked on a percentage scale of 0-100.

% Scale Score	Performance Standard
70+	Excellent pass
60-69	Very Good pass
50-59	Good Pass
40-49	Pass
0-39	Fail

4.5 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.

5 Verification

5.1 The overall assessment process at Futureworks is outlined in the Assessment Process Flowchart (section 20). Heads of School are responsible for ensuring academic staff adhere to the following assessment procedures.

5.2 Verification is the checking and approval of assessment briefs. All summative elements of assessment must be verified for each module. All summative assessment briefs must be internally verified and approved by External Examiners at the start of each academic year before being shared with students and External Examiners must be consulted on any changes to assessment. The process must be documented on the Verification Form.xlsx.

5.3 Internal Verification:

5.3.1 The purpose of internal verification is to ensure that briefs are accurate and appropriate in relation to the intended learning outcomes.

5.3.2 Internal verification must be undertaken by a minimum of two members of academic staff (author and one other) and be recorded on the Verification Form.xlsx.

5.4 External Verification:

5.4.1 External verification involves the review of assessment briefs by the External Examiner.

5.4.2 The External Examiner should review the nature, form and content of all assessment briefs contributing to an award. For established programmes this can be done by exception where changes in an assessment brief require this.

5.4.3 The External Examiner is entitled to review an amended assessment brief on request if substantial changes were suggested after the external review.

5.5 Assessment briefs are stored securely on SharePoint during the verification process. Authors, moderators and External Examiners are provided access to the specific folder for their programme, where they can complete the Verification Form.

5.6 Once assessment briefs have been verified they are uploaded to the relevant module page on the MyFutureworks VLE.

5.7 Finalised assessment briefs are uploaded to the Quality Archive SharePoint.

6 Assessment Information & Scheduling

6.1 Assessment submission deadlines should be defined holistically by the Programme Team to ensure an adequate balance of workload for students and to avoid unnecessary assessment bunching. Dates should be agreed prior to the start of the academic year and published to students in Module Handbooks, alongside assessment briefs and grading criteria.

6.2 The Academic Registry is responsible for collating and publishing assessment schedules for staff and students on the VLE programme pages for the relevant year.

7 Assessment Literacy

7.1 Students should be introduced to the module assessments and grading criteria at the earliest possible opportunity of module delivery, normally within the first week of study. Various methods can be used to further students' assessment literacy, such as discussion of the grading criteria; examples of anonymised student work from previous years; scaffolding of tasks within an assessment; and peer assessment and feedback.

8 Reasonable Adjustments

8.1 Students who declare a disability at the point of enrolment should already have any agreed reasonable adjustments in place prior to assessments taking place. Students who did not declare a disability at enrolment and who believe they need to be granted a reasonable adjustment for a specific assessment should contact their Programme Leader, who will meet with them to discuss what reasonable adjustments can be made. Any reasonable adjustments made should still enable the student to meet the relevant learning outcomes and be approved by the External Examiner. Please refer to the Reasonable Adjustments Procedure in the Extenuating Circumstances Policy for more details and for the full procedure to follow.

9 Coursework Submission Requirements

9.1 Students should submit their assessments via the relevant link on the VLE before the published deadline. For information on late submissions, extensions and exceptional circumstances see the Extenuating Circumstances Policy & Procedure.

9.2 Unless otherwise specified in the assessment brief, coursework submissions should conform to the following guidelines:

9.2.1 All coursework that draws on external sources (text or otherwise) should include a reference list and be correctly referenced using APA referencing style (see https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples).

9.2.2 Electronic data files should be checked to ensure they are in the correct format as specified by the assessment brief.

9.2.3 It is the student's responsibility to check that they are submitting the correct file, in a valid format, within any specified file size limits, by the deadline and to the correct submission link published on the VLE.

9.2.4 File titles should follow the conventions detailed in the Assessment Brief.

9.2.5 If a student submits a file which fails to meet the requirements listed above and the deadline has not yet passed, the student may request to resubmit an amended version.

9.2.6 To avoid loss, students should back up all digitally stored work.

10 Late Submissions

10.1 The Regulations for Validated Awards of the Open University set out the consequences and penalties incurred for late or non-submission of material for assessment. This information can also be found in all Module Handbooks, located on VLE module pages.

11 Practical Assessments & Presentations

11.1 Practical assessments and presentations are referred to as live assessments. They should be conducted by academic staff from the subject area. Students may only bring authorised materials to these assessments. The possession or use of unauthorised materials may infringe on the Futureworks' Academic Integrity Policy. The recording by students of these assessments is not allowed, but such assessments may be recorded by academic staff for Internal and External Moderation.

11.2 Any incidents or abnormalities during an assessment will be recorded and reported to the Programme Leader. Students must arrive in good time for practical assessments and presentations and are advised to be there 15 minutes before the assessment commences.

11.3 If a student arrives after the start time of their live assessment with good reason or they are absent for good reason they may apply for a short extension in line with the Extenuating Circumstances Policy. Students must make every effort to contact their Tutor prior to the start of the assessment to let them know they will be late or not attending and should apply for an extension as soon as is practicable (within 48 hours of the assessment time).

11.4 If an extension is granted the student's assessment will be rescheduled within the same assessment period and the student will not be penalised. If an extension is not granted the student will score 0 for that component of the assessment and they will need to re-sit it in the resit period. Students are not permitted to self-certify for live assessments and must provide evidence when applying for an extension. If they fail to attend a rescheduled assessment on time they will be awarded a score of 0 and they will need to re-sit the assessment in the resit period. Extensions will not be permitted for any live assessment resits. For more information on what constitutes good reason for absence please see our Extenuating Circumstances Policy.

12 Group Work Guidelines

12.1 The guidelines propose good practice to be used when students are undertaking group work within a module. Module Tutors are expected to use these guidelines in the production of any group work assessment briefs and Module Handbooks, as well as throughout any group work assessment.

12.1.1 Equal-sized groups should be created wherever possible. The recommended group size is 3 or 4.

12.1.2 The group size may be larger or smaller depending on the nature and size of the task undertaken. If this is the case the group size should be arrived at in consultation with the Programme Leader and/or Vice Principal.

12.1.3 Throughout the course of a module the size of a group may be unavoidably reduced due to a range of circumstances including members interrupting studies, exceptional circumstances, absence, or withdrawal. Where this occurs the remaining members of the group may be eligible to submit a proportionately reduced submission. The amount of work required to complete the module by the remaining students should meet all of the associated learning outcomes and be arrived at by negotiation between the affected student(s), Module Leader, Programme Leader and/or Vice Principal.

12.1.4 At Level 4, students may not know each other well and it may be more appropriate for the Module Leader to allocate the groups. However, at Levels 5 and 6, the allocation of groups should be a negotiation between students and the Module Leader. The aim should be to ensure that the groups have a balance of skills and the Module Leader must use their judgment to achieve this when negotiating group membership with students.

12.1.5 The Module Leader should clearly explain how groups and individuals will be assessed with an emphasis on how working well within the group will benefit each individual student.

12.1.6 Occasionally at the start of a year, often due to a smaller cohort size, a group has fewer students than envisaged in the original assessment design. The Module Leader may need to amend the submission requirements to take account of the smaller group size. The students affected should be informed of this when they are given the brief, and the

amended submission requirements should be provided at the earliest opportunity. The Module Leader is advised to use academic judgement when proposing amended submission requirements. The revised submission requirements should enable every student in the group to fulfil the learning outcomes detailed for that assessment in the Module Handbook. Any such amendment should avoid simply using a percentage of work needed to fulfil the original brief and be arrived at in consultation with the associated Programme Leader and/or Vice Principal and the External Examiner.

12.1.7 Group assessments should be written in a manner that allows flexibility in the way that assessments are conducted, so that changes in circumstances can be accommodated.

12.1.8 When a student leaves a group, the remaining members of the group must still fulfil the learning outcomes of the module.

12.1.9 When a group member expresses a wish to leave the group and continue as an individual, the first response by the Module Leader should be to arrange a meeting between the group members. The meeting should be an attempt to mediate between the students and explain why it is in their best interest to work in a group. The Module Leader should stress the importance of group work and ask the student to re-join the group. If this fails, the Module Leader should permit the student to leave the group, and follow the recommendations in points 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 (above).

12.1.10 If a Module Leader is unsure about a brief for an assessment, after taking into account the points outlined above, they should seek advice from the Programme Leader and/or Vice Principal.

12.1.11 Group contribution records are recommended to show exactly which student worked on each aspect of the project.

12.1.12 Peer assessment can be a useful tool as part of group assessment. Peer assessment could take the form of feedback seminars, group discussions or a written document. Where peer assessment is not summative i.e. not a part of the validated module assessment strategy then the expected student contribution or indicative word count can be arrived at by negotiation between the Module Leader and student cohort in advance of the task to allow time to prepare.

12.1.13 Feedback should address the group and the individual's contribution and can be delivered in a written, audio or video format.

13 Exams

13.1 Futureworks' assessment strategy focusses on coursework and live assessment; however, programmes which feature Pro Tools tuition include one summative online open-book Pro Tools exams. These are delivered by members of Futureworks staff who are Avid Certified Instructors (ACIs) and who follow Avid's exam proctoring rules. Students are required to take the exam on site in a Futureworks computer lab and they are monitored by invigilators for the duration of the exam. The questions are varied each time the exam is sat. Extension requests for these exams conform to the same rules as for live assessments (see section 11).

14 Marking

14.1 Standardisation

14.1.1 Standardisation is a peer review process, providing an opportunity during the marking and moderation process, to grade, discuss, review and compare examples of previous student work to reach a shared understanding of the academic standards required.

14.1.2 The Vice Principal is responsible for assuring the consistency of marking through subject-based calibration.

14.2 Anonymous Marking

14.2.1 Students should be made aware that their work is not marked anonymously at Futureworks. This is for the following reasons:

- The majority of Futureworks assessments are coursework or practically focussed presentations, meaning it is likely that the first marker will have already provided feedback on the assessment at a formative stage.
- As there is usually only one Tutor delivering a module, which is often of a specialist nature, it is not normally possible for a first marker to be an alternative Tutor teaching on the module.
- Due to small class sizes student work is easily recognisable by the Module Tutor and often across the Programme Team.
- The following mitigations are in place to ensure a fair and robust assessment process:
- Assessment literacy is at the forefront of our approach, ensuring that students and Tutors engage in meaningful dialogue in relation to grading criteria and standards and that these are presented transparently.
- Heads of School assure the consistency of marking through subject-based calibration.
- All assessments are subject to verification and moderation processes.
- The entire cohort's work is double marked when a new tutor is marking.
- Our External Examiners play a critical role in ensuring that the grading criteria has been applied consistently and that a fair assessment process has been maintained

14.3 First Marking

14.3.1 Assessments should be marked by the first assessor against the approved grading criteria and specification as defined in the assessment brief. Where the assessor suspects the use of unfair means (e.g. cheating, plagiarism) by a student or group of students within an assessment, the assessor is responsible for progressing the matter in accordance with the Futureworks' Academic Integrity Policy and Misconduct Procedure.

15 Moderation Process

15.1 Moderation is an important means to assure students, assessment boards and other interested parties that the standards expected of and achieved by our students are appropriate, fair and consistent. Moderation also helps to share good practice among colleagues and should be seen as an important part of staff training and development.

15.2 Internal moderation should take place before provisional grades are released to students and should be conducted for each assessment component. The Programme Leader, in consultation with the Vice Principal or Principal, will decide the most appropriate form of moderation for a specific assessment. Students are made aware that any grades released prior to assessment boards are provisional and subject to external moderation. Depending on the type of assessment one of the following approaches will be taken:

15.2.1 **Double marking** is defined as two assessors working together to assess a full cohort against the validated learning outcomes, interpreting the associated grading criteria and discussing the work to arrive at agreed moderated grades. This is recorded in the associated Moderation Form and double marking identified in the relevant comments box. If a final mark cannot be agreed between the two assessors the Vice Principal will determine a final mark. All capstone modules, e.g. Level 6 Major Project, will undergo double marking.

15.2.2 **Moderating a sample** is defined as a second assessor working with, or with access to 1st marker comments to verify marks for a sample of the cohort submission against the validated learning outcomes, following the grading criteria to arrive at a mutually agreed grade for each piece of work. The sample size should be, equal to or greater than the square root of the group OR top, middle, bottom, 1st-s and fails – whichever is the greater. The moderation process is completed in discussion with the first assessor to arrive at agreed grades. This is recorded in the associated Moderation Form and moderated sample marking identified in the relevant comments box. If a final grade cannot be agreed between the two assessors the Vice Principal will determine a final mark.

15.2.3 **Second marking** is defined as a second assessor independently assessing all or a sample of the cohort submission against the validated learning outcomes, following the associated grading criteria to arrive at a second mark for each piece of work. The sample size should be, equal to or greater than the square root of the group OR top, middle, bottom, 1st-s and fails – whichever is the greater. The moderation process is completed in discussion with the first assessor to arrive at agreed grades. This is recorded in the associated Moderation Form and second marking identified in the relevant comments

box. If a final grade cannot be agreed between the two assessors the Vice Principal (or nominee) will act as third assessor in order to decide this.

15.3 Discrepancies

15.3.1 First and second assessor marks are arrived at through interpretation and academic judgement and due to the creative nature of the subject areas, can and do vary. A significant discrepancy is where one or more marks land in a different classification band, warranting further discussion, and widening of the sample in order to arrive at agreed grades and consistency across the whole cohort.

15.3.2 Where there is a significant discrepancy between first and second assessor marks a discussion should take place to establish consistency in following the grading criteria. This may involve widening the sample or reviewing the full cohort. If the issue cannot be resolved between the first and second assessor, the Vice Principal (or nominee) should act as the third assessor in order to arrive at a final grade, in consultation with the External Examiner. A brief rationale for the final grade should be recorded in the relevant comments box. The Vice Principal will ensure that amendments made to marks due to discrepancies are applied to the whole cohort to ensure consistency and fairness to students.

15.4 Scaling

15.4.1 Scaling is the systematic adjustment of a set of grades for an assessment task in order to ensure that they more accurately reflect the achievements of the students concerned against the grading criteria. Scaling can be considered if the proposed grades fail to reflect student performance adequately and/or if there has been a procedural irregularity in the assessment/marking process which cannot be compensated for in other ways.

15.4.2 Scaling is normally proposed by the Programme Leader and requires the permission of the Vice Principal, who will have assured themselves that there are valid reasons to consider the scaling of grades. Wherever possible, the External Examiner should be consulted to agree the approach to scaling and the allowance which is proposed. The Academic Registrar may also be consulted for regulatory advice.

15.4.3 Where scaling is used, it should be applied at the level of the assessment component and would cover the entire cohort or a specific subset of that cohort and never be applied only to an individual student. Scaling should take place before provisional grades are returned to students if possible so that the provisional grades which students receive are already scaled.

15.5 External Moderation

15.5.1 Following internal moderation procedures, the External Examiner for the relevant programme moderates a sample of the cohort submission. External moderation is defined as an external moderator independently reviewing a sample of the cohort submission to check if the grading criteria has been applied fairly and consistently and that assessment processes have been fair.

15.5.2 The sample size should be, equal to or greater than the square root of the group OR top, middle, bottom, 1sts and fails – whichever is the greater. The External Examiner cannot propose changes to individual student grades. If an issue with application of the grading criteria is identified during external moderation the External Examiner can request that the relevant section, or the whole assessment depending on the extent of the issue, should be remarked for the whole cohort or relevant subset of the cohort. If an issue is identified relating to the assessment process the External Examiner can request that scaling is applied if appropriate.

15.6 Storage of Moderated Student Work

15.6.1 Student work included in internal and external moderation is downloaded from the MyFutureworks VLE and stored on a secure SharePoint, where internal and external moderators can view the work and complete the Moderation Form.

15.6.2 Moderation documentation is kept for the current year plus 5 further academic years before it is deleted from the SharePoint.

15.7 Feedback on Assessment

15.7.1 Marking and internal moderation should be completed internally within 15 working days of the assessment submission date. After this time provisional grades can be released and feedback should be available for students with the exception of final year students

in their second semester, whose full set of grades will not be released until after assessment boards.

15.7.2 It must be made clear to students that any grades released prior to assessment boards are provisional only. Futureworks feedback sheets should be used to help ensure parity in the quality of feedback received by all students. Feedback can also be provided in the form of videos, voice recordings uploaded to the VLE and face-to-face in 1-1 meetings.

16 Preparation for Assessment Boards

16.1 Grade sheets are prepared by the Academic Registry ahead of each academic year in accordance with module specifications. Once internal moderation is complete Programme Leaders will add assessment grades to the grade sheets, which will be used for the module assessment board. Programme Teams will then convene to check grade sheets against the grades recorded on the VLE.

16.2 Upon confirmation that grade sheets are correct Programme Leaders should upload them to the Board of Examiners secure SharePoint for Academic Registry to check. Any queries will be resolved with Programme Leaders prior to the assessment board.

17 Assessment Boards

17.1 The Academic Board is required to agree the membership of the Board of Examiners and the dates of assessment boards ahead of each academic year. All assessment grades must be ratified at the Module Assessment Board, which takes place once per semester in February and May/June. At the Programme Assessment Board in June the Board of Examiners is authorised to determine the progression of students in accordance with the Academic Regulations and to recommend progression, or the conferment of validated awards of The Open University. The Programme Reassessment Board takes place in August.

17.2 A recommendation list must be signed by the Chair of the Board of Examiners, the External Examiners and The Open University's representative at the Board of Examiners, confirming that the assessments have been carried out in accordance with the requirements of The Open University and that the recommendations have received the written approval of the External Examiners.

17.3 Following Programme Assessment Boards a recommendation list, which must be submitted to the Open University at ouvp-examboards@open.ac.uk within 2 working days of the assessment board, will then be approved for progression and final outcomes, as well as credits for single registerable modules. Approval will take place within 7 working days of receiving the recommendation list.

17.4 Following ratification of progression and exit outcomes by the OU, grades and outcomes are bulk uploaded into the student record system by the Academic Registry and checked by producing a report, which is then automatically compared with the grade sheet data.

18 Retention of Assessed Work

18.1 In order to help satisfy OfS Condition B4: Assessment and awards and Condition B5: Sector-recognised standards, as well as assuring ourselves that our students are being assessed effectively, Futureworks retains a sample of student work from each academic year for a total of 5 years following the end of that cohort's programme.

18.2 Moderated student work from each programme, level, and module, including samples from high, middle and low points in the range of grades plus any fails, are retained. Futureworks' approach is to retain a sample of student work for each module, rather than to keep all student work, due to the size of student submissions, many of which are audio or audio-visual recordings. Student work, feedback sheets, assessment briefs, moderation forms and grading criteria are stored on a secure SharePoint.

19 Staff Development & Training

19.1 Heads of School are responsible for ensuring that new members of the academic team are trained on the assessment regulations, policy and procedure. All marking completed by a new academic staff member is double marked by an experienced member of the team. The Academic Registrar is responsible for ensuring that members of the Academic Registry involved in the administration of assessments are suitably trained.

20 Other Relevant Policies & Procedures

20.1 Regulations for Validated Awards of the Open University

20.2 Academic Integrity Policy & Misconduct Procedure

20.3 Learning, Teaching & Assessment Strategy 2024-26

20.4 Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure

20.5 Student Complaints Policy and Procedure

21 Assessment Procedure

Assessment Design	• Drafting of Assessment Brief and grading criteria by Module or Programme Leader following programme (re)validation. • Amendment/replacement of Assessment Brief following annual Module Review.
Verification	• Internal verification of assessment brief and grading criteria by Programme Leader or Vice Principal. • External verification of assessment brief and grading criteria by External Examiner prior to start of academic year.
Publishing	• Assessment brief and grading criteria shared with students in Module Handbooks (uploaded to VLE module page prior to start of Week 1 of teaching). • Assessment Timetable published on programme pages of VLE.
Assessment Literacy	• Students engaged with assessment brief and grading criteria to promote understanding of requirements and standards from Week 1 of teaching onwards.
Assessment Submission	• Assessments completed and submitted by students via submission link on VLE module page. • Students required to complete delaration that work is their own work as part of submission.
Marking	• First marking by first assessor in line with assessment criteria and grade added on VLE • First marker completes feedback form (and feedback in other medium if applicable) and uploads to VLE. • Moderation Form completed by first assessor and moderated samples uploaded to secure SharePoint.
Internal Moderation	• Moderation completed by second assessor. • Double marking/second marking/internal moderation by second internal assessor and marks agreed. • Moderation Form updated by second assessor.
Marks Released	• Provisional grades and feedback released to students within 15 days of assessment submission (except Level 6 semester 2).
Grade Sheets	• Grade sheets completed by Programme Leaders from grades on VLE. • Programme Team checking meetings conducted to verify accuracy of grade sheets. • Programme Leaders upload grade sheets to Board of Examiners SharePoint.
External Moderation	• External moderation by External Examiner prior to Programme Assessment Board (June). Samples for moderation uploaded to SharePoint by Programme Leaders.
Assessment Boards	• Grade sheets checked by Academic Registry and any queries resolved with Programme Leaders. • Grades confirmed at Assessment Boards and recommendations made about progression, exit awards and exit credit (for single registerable modules).
Open University Ratification	• Recomendations list for Progression and exit outcomes (and credit for single resgiterable modules) submitted to OU for ratification within 2 working days of Programme Assessment Board. • Progression and exit outcomes (and credit for single resgisterable modules) approved by the OU within 7 working days of receipt.
Grades Released	• Grades and exit outcomes bulk uploaded into Futureworks student record system by Data & Compliance Officer; report run and checked against grade sheets • Grades and outcomes released to students via student record system portal; email alert sent to students.