

Regent College London

Pearson BTEC HND Business Assessment Regulations

For the Pearson HN Specification for teaching from September 2016 For all cohorts from September 2016 onwards

1 Purpose

- 1.1 To provide assessment regulations for assessment on the Pearson HN Business Specification for first teaching from September 2016 onwards and clarify marking of resubmitted and referred student work.
- 1.2 To provide further detail of assessment regulations to support those provided in Regent College London's (the College) Programme Specification for the HND Business programme.

2 Background

- 2.1 The Pearson BTEC HN Business Programme Specification for teaching from September 2016 onwards (currently Issue 5 - 2018), provides clear and specific guidelines and regulations for certain assessment matters including late completion of assignments, failure (Unclassified grade) at first submission, repeat of units and progression to the second year of a full-time course.
- 2.2 Cohorts of students who started the first year of their Pearson BTEC HND Business course before September 2016 are assessed according to guidelines given in the Pearson BTEC HND Specification of 2011. The College's Assessment Regulations for these students is provided separately.

3 QAA Quality Code

- 3.1 This Policy aligns with the UK Quality Code core and common practices in

Expectation for Standards:

The academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.

The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards.

The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications frameworks.

The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

Where a provider 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.

The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.

The provider reviews its core practices for standards regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement.

Expectations for Quality:

Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed.

From admission through to completion, all students are provided with the support that they need to succeed in and benefit from higher education.

- The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.
- The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.
- The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.
- The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.
- The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.
- Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.
- The provider engages students individually and collectively in the development, assurance and enhancement of the quality of their educational experience.
- The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.
- The provider reviews its core practices for quality regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement.
- The provider's approach to managing quality takes account of external expertise.
- The provider engages students individually and collectively in the development, assurance and enhancement of the quality of their educational experience.

This Policy also incorporates the following Guiding Principles set out in

the Advice and Guidance for Assessment:

- 1. Assessment methods and criteria are aligned to learning outcomes and teaching activities
- 2. Assessment is reliable, consistent, fair and valid
- 4. Assessment is inclusive and equitable
- 5. Assessment is explicit and transparent
- 6. Assessment and feedback is purposeful and supports the learning process
- 7. Assessment is timely
- 9. Students are supported and prepared for assessment
- 10. Assessment encourages academic integrity

4 BTEC Centre Guide to Assessment: Level 4 to 7

4.1 The BTEC Centre Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment: Level 4 to 7, 2018-19 offers centres general guidance concerning assessment regulations. With respect to students meeting deadlines for submitting assessments the following guidance is offered:

- *Students need to be aware of the importance of meeting assessment deadlines... Students may be given authorised extensions for legitimate reasons, such as illness, at the time of submission, in accordance with the provider's policies. This means that students are all assessed according to the same conditions and that some are not advantaged by having additional time or opportunity to learn from others.*
- *Students should only be given authorised extensions for legitimate reasons and extenuating circumstances, such as illness at the time of submission... If an extension is granted, the new deadline must be recorded and adhered to.*

The assessment regulations provided below are intended to be consistent with this guidance from BTEC.

4.2 The assessment regulations detailed below represent guidance provided by Pearson Higher Nationals Business, First Teaching September 2016, First Certification from 2017, Issue 5 and policies and procedures of Regent College London reflecting the devolved responsibilities granted as an approved Pearson Centre for the delivery of the HND Business programme.

4.3 All students will be treated fairly and equitably with respect to all aspects of the assessment process.

4.4 Regent College will publish and inform students of deadlines by which they are to hand in their Unit assignments. These deadlines must be adhered to by students and staff are asked to ensure that they are fully aware of the published deadlines for the submission of assessed work.

4.5 Late submission of assessed work

4.5.1 Assessed work submitted after the published deadline may be categorised as either (a) late without an extension being granted to the student using Regent College's Extenuating Circumstances policy and procedure, or (b) Late with no explanation or extension granted to the student.

4.6 With respect to the submissions of late work or referrals the BTEC Centre Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment offers the following guidance:

*A student may request or be offered a resubmission if they have not met all of the criteria (Pass, Merit or Distinction) available in an assignment. You must not cap resubmissions at Pass level, although **if a student who submitted their work late is offered a resubmission, this is capped at Pass level***.*

Resubmissions can be authorised by the Programme Leader or the Assessment Board and should only be authorised if all of the following submission conditions are met:

- *The student has met the initial deadlines set in the assignment, has met an agreed deadline extension, or has submitted work late that has been accepted**
- *The assessor judges that the student has fully attempted to achieve all targeted learning outcomes in their original submission*
- *The assessor judges that the student will be able to provide improved evidence without further guidance*

- *The assessor has authenticated the evidence submitted for assessment.*
- If a student has not met the conditions listed above, the Programme Leader or Assessment Board must not authorise a resubmission.*
- In these instances, the student will be required to repeat the unit.*
- * If you have accepted student work that has been submitted late, a resubmission can only be authorised if the work has not met the Pass criteria and can only provide an opportunity for the student to achieve the Pass criteria.*
- We strongly recommend that you do not accept work that has been submitted late, and for which an extension was not requested and approved, under any circumstances.***

- 4.6.1 In view of the above guidance from Pearson students who submit assessed work after the published deadline and without an extension being granted using Regent College's extenuating circumstances policy and procedure will be subject to the following regulations:
- i. Assessed work submitted late, without prior approval of an extension or submission of Extenuating Circumstances, will not be marked or graded.
 - ii. In such cases, the student may be asked to resubmit assessed work for a different assignment brief for that unit. Such a decision is at the discretion of the Assessment Board.
 - iii. Where a student submits assessed work later than the published deadline and has an approved extension through use of the extenuating circumstances procedure the work will be marked with no penalty. This only applies where the student submits the assessed work to the deadline granted through the extenuating circumstances procedure.
 - iv. Where a student is granted an extension to the published deadline through using the extenuating circumstances procedure but submits work later than the revised deadline (i) or (ii) above will apply.
- 4.7 Non-submission of assessed work
- 4.7.1 Where a student does not to submit assessed work to a published deadline or does not submit assessed work to an extended deadline the student will be deemed to have failed the assessment and will be recorded as a non-submission (NS) in the student record system.
- 4.7.2 The decision to permit the student a resubmission, following non-submission, is the responsibility of the Assessment Board. The decision should be taken in the context of the UK Quality Code, and the Pearson Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment. To be fair to all students the Assessment Board needs to record good reasons where a decision to permit resubmission is not granted.
- 4.7.3 Any resubmission of assessed work following non-submission will require the student to address a new and different assignment brief for that unit. A maximum Pass grade can be achieved.
- 4.8 Resubmission opportunity
- 4.8.1 The Pearson HN Business Specification for First Teaching from September 2016, Issue 5 offers the following guidance for how a Centre should provide resubmission opportunities for assessed work that has failed (Unclassified) to achieve a Pass grade:
- An assignment provides the final assessment for the relevant learning outcomes and is normally a final assessment decision. A student who, for the first assessment opportunity, has failed to achieve a Pass for that unit specification **shall be expected to undertake a reassessment.***
- *Only one opportunity for reassessment of the unit will be permitted.*
 - *Reassessment for course work, project- or portfolio-based assessments shall normally involve the reworking of the original task.*
 - *For examinations, reassessment shall involve completion of a new task.*

- *A student who undertakes a reassessment will have their grade capped at a Pass for that unit.*
- *A student will not be entitled to be reassessed in any component of assessment for which a Pass grade or higher has already been awarded.*

4.8.2 In view of the guidance in 4.8.1 above from Pearson the following assessment regulations will apply:

- A student who has failed to achieve a Pass grade for assessed work will be permitted one opportunity for re-assessment
- Where the assessed work has been awarded an 'Unclassified' grade and the work has been submitted to a published or agreed deadline and there is no evidence of academic misconduct the student will normally be granted one opportunity for reassessment by reworking the initial piece of assessed work.
- Where a resubmission is granted the student will be given a deadline for making the resubmission. Late resubmission of the assessed work will be treated in accordance with 4.6.1 above.
- Where a student has been granted the opportunity to resubmit a piece of assessed work and does not make a resubmission the student will be treated according to 4.7.1 above.

4.9 Repeat Units

4.9.1 The Pearson HN Business Specification for First Teaching from September 2016, Issue 5 offers the following guidance for how a Centre should approach permitting a student to repeat a unit of study:

A student who, for the first assessment opportunity and resubmission opportunity, still failed to achieve a Pass for that unit specification:

- *At Centre discretion and Assessment Board, decisions can be made to permit a repeat of a unit.*
- *The student must study the unit again with full attendance and payment of the unit fee.*
- *The overall unit grade for a successfully completed repeat unit is capped at a Pass for that unit.*
- *Units can only be repeated once.*

4.9.2 In view of the guidance given above the following regulations will apply with respect to students repeating a unit or units of study:

- Where a student has failed to achieve a Pass grade for a piece of assessed work at both first assessment and resubmission opportunity the Assessment Board may, at its discretion, permit the student to repeat the unit of study. The Assessment Board must record the reasons used to inform this decision.
- A student who is permitted to repeat a unit under 4.9.2(i) above may only repeat a unit of study once.
- In repeating a unit of study under 4.9.2(i) above the student must attend all scheduled teaching and learning activities and show full attendance through the College's Attendance Monitoring system and pay the unit fee as determined by the College.
- In repeating a unit of study under 4.9.2(i) above the student grade for the assignment(s) will be capped at a Pass grade.

4.10 Progression from Level 4 (Year 1) to Level 5 (Year 2)

4.10.1 The Pearson HN Business Specification for First Teaching from September 2016, Issue 1 offers the following guidance for requirements for a student to progress from Level 4 (Year 1 of full-time study) to Level 5 (Year 2 of full-time study):

Pearson would expect that an HND student would have achieved at least 90 credits at Level 4 before progressing to Level 5 units. This allows for the students to submit the remaining 30 credits

at Level 4 while undertaking their Level 5 study.

- 4.10.2 In view of this guidance Regent College requires a student to achieve at least 90 credits at Level 4 to progress to Level 5. For full-time students this means that at the end of their first year of studies of Level 4 units in the HND Business programme 90 credits at Level 4 are required for progression to the second year of full-time study at Level 5.
- 4.10.3 It is the responsibility of the Assessment Board to make and record decisions concerning the progression of students from Level 4 (first year of full time study) to Level 5 (second year of full time study).
- 4.11 Extenuating circumstances
- 4.11.1 Students who are unable to meet published deadlines for handing in assessed work may use the College's Extenuating Circumstances Student Guide and procedure to request an extension to a deadline (teaching staff should refer to the Extenuating Circumstances Staff Guide). The Extenuating Circumstances Student Guide and Staff Guide and form can be found on the website or on HELP (the College's VLE). This will be recorded within Student Records as 'EC' alongside the grade achieved.
- 4.11.2 It is the responsibility of the student to request an extension to a deadline using the Extenuating Circumstances procedure and form in advance of the date of the deadline.
- 4.11.3 A student may only be granted an extension to a deadline through using the Extenuating Circumstances Policy and procedure, which is available on the website and HELP.
- 4.11.4 If a student has not had their request approved for an extension to a deadline, made through using the Extenuating Circumstances form, then the assessment will be regarded as a late submission. Assessed work submitted late, without prior approval of an extension or submission of Extenuating Circumstances, will not be marked or graded and will recorded as a 'Non-Submission'.
- 4.12 Academic Misconduct
- 4.12.1 Staff teaching and assessing students must use the College's Academic Misconduct Policy and procedure for dealing with any instances of suspected academic misconduct.
- 4.12.2 Opportunities for resubmission of assessed work where academic misconduct has been demonstrated and noted by the Assessment Board will be capped at a pass grade.
- 4.13 At Risk Policy
- 4.13.1 Where a student has their work referred and does not resubmit to the published deadline they will be treated under the 'at risk' policy and referred to the appropriate Cohort or Programme Leader.
- 4.14 Assessment Board
- 4.14.1 The Assessment Board records decisions, in the Student Record system and through minutes of the meeting, for each individual student and these decisions will be communicated to the student following the meeting of the Assessment Board.
- 4.14.2** A student may appeal against a decision taken by an Assessment Board using the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure, which is available on the website and the HELP.

Documents referred to in the above Assessment Regulations:

- Pearson Higher Nationals in Business Specification, First Teaching from September 2016, First Certification from 2017, Issue 5
- BTEC Centre Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment: Level 4 to 7, 2018-19
- Regent College London's Extenuating Circumstances Student Guide
- Regent College London's Extenuating Circumstances Staff Guide

- Regent College London's Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure
- Regent College London's Students At Risk Policy

<i>Author</i>	<i>Head of Standards & Quality Enhancement</i>
<i>Version</i>	<i>Version 5.3</i>
<i>Update</i>	<i>Revised June 2019</i>
<i>Approval</i>	<i>Academic Board July 2019</i>
<i>Review Date</i>	<i>August 2020</i>