

**Assessment and Moderation Policy
for The Open University
Awards (2026-27)**

21/07/26

SLT Responsibility – Adam Fahey
Policy Author – Matthew Twitchett



Significant changes following review of strategy

Page Number or Heading Name	Details of significant change	Changes made by
N/A	No changes as a result of review	Matthew Twitchett

This policy has been approved by The Open University through its Institutional and administrative revalidation complete in June 2023.

This policy is available in an alternative format on request including a word version.

Equality Impact Assessment

The aim of an equality impact assessment (EIA) is to consider the equality implications of any new or amended policy, procedure, practice, project, function on different groups of staff, students and visitors to the college. This EIA tool provides a simple framework that helps evaluate whether the change may inadvertently disadvantage protected characteristics and identify ways to proactively advance and promote equality.

You will need to consider each of the equations and provide information as to consideration and any changes made in relation to Equality, diversity and inclusion.

Date EIA completed.	21-07-26
Name of person responsible for completing the EIA	Matthew Twitchett
Role of person responsible for completing the EIA	Executive Director of Quality, Teaching and Learning
Who is affected by the policy / decision / change	Students and Staff employed
What's the reason for the new policy / change in policy, practice, process etc.	This is a yearly review and update required by awarding organisations

You will need to consider whether it's possible that the proposed new policy / change in policy / procedure/practice etc could discriminate or unfairly discriminate or disadvantage people. You should consider:

Who gets to participate	Who does not, or who now does not due to the changes proposed / made.
Who is at an advantage	Who is at a disadvantage, and again has this changed?
Who will benefit	Who will not benefit (or who did and now doesn't due to the changes proposed in policy
Who can access the policy	Who cannot or now cannot.

Protected Characteristic	What degree of impact does the change have (score 1-5 with one being lowest impact and 5 being the highest)	What is a potential positive, neutral or negative impact? Include what you have considered. Are there any barriers?	What action will be taken to address any negative impact or remove any potential barriers identified? Note if we are not able to resolve anything identified.	Date by when and whom will this action be taken.
Age	1	None identified		
Disability	1	Some students may need support in understanding the policy. This will be provided by the student support teams in the College.	Students with an identified disability can seek support from a Carer/Parent or Guardian and the College.	As and when required
Gender (Sex)	1	None identified		
Gender Reassignment	1	None identified		
Marriage or Civil Partnership	1	None identified		
Pregnancy / Maternity	1	None identified		
Race	1	None identified		
Religion or Religious Belief	1	None Identified		
Sexual Orientation	1	None identified		
Any other element that needs to be considered.	1	None identified		

Note:

1. The terms stated under protected characteristics are the terminology used in the Equality Act 2010.
2. As part of the policy approval process Executive Board will consider the EIA assessment and any potential barriers which we may not be able to overcome and whether the action proposed will mitigate sufficiently within legislation or whether we decide to not implement the new policy if the risk are significant. If the policy is approved the EIA is also approved.

South Essex College Group

1. Assessment, progression and award of credit

- 1.1 The forms of assessment and its weighting and timing, and the ways in which the learning outcomes are to be demonstrated through assessment, are set out in the module and programme specifications approved by The Open University at the point of validation.
- 1.2 Each programme handbook contains comprehensive details of the assessment scheme as approved by The Open University in the validation process.
- 1.3 Please refer to the Assessment Flow Chart – South Essex College: Open University which provides a graphical representation of the assessment process including timeframes.

2. Minimum requirements for pass

- 2.1 To obtain an Open University award students are required to complete all parts of the programme's approved assessment and comply with all regulations relating to their programme of study.
- 2.2 The minimum aggregate pass marks for The Open University validated awards are:

40% for undergraduate programmes

50% for postgraduate programmes.

These minima apply to assessments, modules, stages and qualifications.

3. Identification of requirements from professional, statutory and regulatory bodies

- 3.1 Additional academic regulations required by any professional, statutory or recognised regulatory body will be set out in the relevant programme specification and approved by The Open University in the validation process.

4. Submission of assessed work

- 4.1 Work submitted for a summative assessment component cannot be amended after submission or re-submitted.
- 4.2 Student requests for extensions to assessment deadlines will not be approved unless made in accordance with published partner institution guidelines as approved by The Open University.

- 4.3 Where coursework is submitted late and there are no accepted extenuating circumstances it will be penalised in line with the following tariff:
- Submission within 6 working days after the deadline date: a 10% reduction deducted from the overall marked score for each working day late, down to the 40% pass mark (for UG) and 50% pass Mark (PG awards) and no further.

Submission that is late by 7 or more working days: submission refused, mark of 0.

The following is for illustrative purposes only

Working days Late	Assignment Mark	Explanation of reduction
0	71	Original uncapped mark
1	64	$71 - (71 \times 10\%)$
2	58	$64 - (64 \times 10\%)$
3	52	$58 - (58 \times 10\%)$
4	47	$52 - (52 \times 10\%)$
5	42	$47 - (47 \times 10\%)$
6	40	Mark would be below the pass mark of 40
7	0	

Students who fail to submit work for assessments or attend examinations shall be deemed to have failed the assessments components concerned and will be marked as 0.

Late submission does not apply to the summer resit period and any summer re-sit work required following the final exam board must be submitted by the date given on the Higher Education Assessment Year Planner.

A working day is defined by the partner and submission after the deadline will be assumed to be the next working day. For South Essex College, a working day will be Monday to Friday.

5. Assessment scores and determining a module outcome

5.1 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

5.2 All postgraduate assessment will be marked on a percentage scale of 0-100. Taught postgraduate awards may include merit and/or distinction classification (see paragraph 18.1).

% Scale Score	Performance Standard
70+	Distinction
60-69	Merit
50-59	Pass
0-49	Fail

- 5.3 The final grade for an individual assessment component will be determined after completion of a quality assurance process (e.g. moderation, remarking) as detailed in section 6.0 below.
- 5.4 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.
- 5.5 Academic outcomes are determined at task level, aggregated based on weightings to determine the outcome for each module, where each task has achieved a passing mark of 40% or above, demonstrating that all learning outcomes have been demonstrated sufficiently.
- 5.6 The academic outcome for each task is determined using the ITE Grading Grid. Performance indicators described in the ITE Grading Grid are prescribed within each module's brief, identifying specific performance indicators mapped to each task undertaken in order for assessors to determine the outcome.
- 5.7 Assessors are to interpret the performance indicators described in the ITE Grading Grid within the context of each module's task to maintain the consistency of levelness in assessment across the programme. Assessors are to demonstrate how the grading decision has been reached using the prescribed performance indicators within the feedback provided to trainees.
- 5.8 The overall module mark shall be determined as per the assessment strategy detailed in the module specification and published in the Programme Handbook.
- 5.9 A student who passes a module shall be awarded the credit for that module. The amount of credit for each module shall be set out in the programme specification and published in the Programme Handbook.

- 5.10 In order to pass a module a student must achieve the requirement of the module as set out in the module specification and published in the Programme Handbook.

6. Marking and moderation

Assessment Strategy

- 6.1 All assessment briefs prior to being issued to trainees will be signed off by the External Examiner.
- 6.2 Each course or set of courses have an assessment strategy, for approval in the annual monitoring process. The assessment strategy will address the following issues:
- Diversity of assessment within a course;
 - Coverage of module learning outcomes by assessment methods;
 - The balance between monitored and unmonitored assessment;
 - Approaches to prevent and detect plagiarism in assessment;
 - Professional Body Requirements, if appropriate;

and in cases of where programmes are proposing to have modules assessed by 100% coursework:

- Appropriate use of the academic year;
- Approaches to assessment for the discipline at other comparable institutions.

Assessment of Performance-based Coursework (including oral presentations)

- 6.3 Performance-based assessment with a permanent output, capable of being shown to the External Examiner will be subject to the normal policy for essays/assignments, but only where the permanent output relates directly to the assessment criteria. For example, a presentation where output such as a PowerPoint document is submitted would still count as performance-based coursework with non-permanent output, unless a learning outcome being assessed is academic content rather than presentation skill.

- 6.4 Performance-based assessment with a non-permanent output worth up to and including 40% of a module may be single marked. Where this type of assessment contributes to more than 40% of a module, work must be either double-marked, team marked, video/audio recorded or attended by the external examiner based on 100% coverage of the whole cohort.

Assessment of Group Work

- 6.5 Group work with a permanent output is subject to the normal moderation process for essays/assignments.
- 6.6 Group work with a non-permanent output is subject to the policy for the assessment of performance-based coursework.
- 6.7 The maximum amount that a joint mark (where a single group mark is derived from people working together in a group) can contribute to a single module is 25%.

Marks for Participation

- 6.8 Marks for participation may contribute no more than 5 percent of the overall mark of a module and the marks should relate to a module learning outcome.

Moderation of Work-based Learning/Placement

- 6.9 The assessment of work-based learning/placement should be subject to the normal departmental procedures in respect of moderation and external examining.

Requests from students to have their work re-marked

- 6.10 Where coursework has a permanent output and is single marked, students have the right to request formal re-marking of a piece of work if they disagree with the original.
- 6.11 Where coursework has a permanent output and is marked by single marking with moderation, students have the right to request that a piece of work is re-marked if they disagree with the original mark in one or both of the following circumstances:

- If procedural/administrative error is suspected.
- If their work was not initially included in a sample of work moderated.

Students are required to make direct request, providing a rationale for their requirements to the HE Examinations team, who will then action and log the request.

- 6.12 The right under 2 above can only be exercised if the student has had a meeting with the initial marker of the work (or a substitute appointed by the Executive Director of Quality, Teaching and Learning where the initial marker is unavailable) to obtain further feedback on the reason for the initial mark, and had subsequently made the request for re-marking, on the form provided for that purpose, including the signature of the first marker or substitute as a confirmation that the meeting has taken place, within two weeks of term time from the date of initial feedback to students. Students must be aware that marks can decrease, increase or remain the same after the re-marking. The right to a remark under 2 above can only be requested, for any particular piece of work, on one occasion.
- 6.13 When work is re-marked on another basis, it must be second or double marked by another member of staff. The marks must be reconciled. The relevant department must publish its policy on how students can request such re-marking, and they must warn students that marks can go down as well as up. The relevant department are advised to set a deadline for students to submit their requests for re-marking. It can determine the appropriate level of feedback to give the student on the re-marked work.
- 6.14 Students cannot request that their exams are re-marked unless a procedural / administration error is suspected.

Reconciliation of Marks

- 6.15 Where two members of staff are involved in marking a piece of work, the markers should make every effort to agree a mark, rather than merely averaging the two marks. The relevant department must keep a full record of both individual and agreed marks for all work which is second or double marked.

- 6.16 Where the two internal markers are unable to reach agreement, the relevant department should make every effort to resolve the matter internally, for example by involving a third person to provide guidance or, if necessary, to act as a third marker. Work should only be sent to an External Examiner, who will be asked to provide guidance, in exceptional circumstances. The External must be given access to written comments from internal markers on the piece(s) of work involved.

The Role of the External Examiner

- 6.17 Unless the External has been specifically sent work to arbitrate on a dispute between internal markers, the External's role will be as a moderator. Externals should not act as second markers. In moderating student work the Module External is providing an independent overview of the consistency of approaches to assessment. As such, the Module External's primary concern is with the overall marking standard in the module rather than with marks obtained by individual students. The External should not alter the marks of any individual student.
- 6.18 The External Examiner (EE) will be sent samples of work across all modules covering a section of work including all fails and all borderline cases. In the case of small cohorts, the EE may wish to see all the work to sample, or they will decide on the sample size. The student work shared with the external examiner will include all written and presented works produced by learners, including video captured presentations and portfolios.

Marking the Work of Students who are Partners or Close Relatives

- 6.19 Staff should not mark the work of partners or close relatives unless approval is given by the Director of Performance and Standards. In the case of a query, the Head of the department should determine whether there is a conflict of interest.

Moderating/Second Marking/ Double Marking the Work by Staff who are Partners or Close Relatives

- 6.20 Staff should not act as moderator or second marker where their partner or close relative is the first marker unless approval is given by the Executive Director of

Quality, Teaching and Learning. In the case of a query, the Executive Director of Quality, Teaching and Learning will determine whether there is a conflict of interest.

Marking Policy for all Taught Students

Coursework	Marking Protocol (minimum requirements)
A task worth up to and including 40% of an individual module: - Essays/assignments - Coursework tests using written answer papers, including in-class tests and progress tests - Performance-based coursework with a permanent output, capable of being shown to the External Examiner - Performance-based coursework with a non- permanent output - Group work with a permanent output - Group work with a non-permanent output	Single marked. Anonymous moderation required for new staff and assessed coursework titles and tests marked by multiple staff.
A task contributing more than 40% of an individual module: - Essays/assignments - Coursework tests using written answer papers, including in-class tests and progress tests - Performance-based coursework with a permanent output, capable of being shown to the External Examiner - Group work with a permanent output	All fails must be (Anonymous) second-marked and a random sample (10%) must also be (Anonymously) moderated A minimum random sample of 10% (minimum 4) per cohort of the submissions is subject to second marking. The sample must include any and all works which do not receive a passing grade and all works submitted by candidates who are employed by South Essex College.

	In instances when only a sample of work is second marked, this will include a range of grades and will include all work where the mark is borderline between two grades.
Coursework testing using OMR sheets or online testing tools Coursework marked to a marking schedule	An independent check must be made to ensure that the programme is working accurately and that marks have been assigned to the correct candidates.
Individual items of coursework comprising at least 30 credits (including PGT Dissertation and final year undergraduate project reports)	All must be second marked or double marked. (Anonymously)
Performance-based coursework with a non- permanent output that contributes to more than 40% of a single module Group work with a non-permanent output that contributes to more than 40% of a single module	All must be (Anonymously) double-marked or team marked, or video/audio recorded or attended by the external examiner.
Examination	Marking Protocol
All exams at level 4; and exams at level 5 which count for 50% or less of the module mark	The scripts only need to be (Anonymously) single-marked, but all fails must be second-marked and a random sample (10%) must also be moderated. Where a formal marking schedule is in place it is not necessary to second-mark or sample - but an independent check must be made on all mark's calculations. Marking schedules must be reviewed as part of the

	department's procedures for reviewing draft exam papers.
All exams at level 5 which count for greater than 50% of the module mark; and all exams at level 6 and 7	All scripts must be (Anonymously) second marked, double marked or marked to a marking schedule

7.0 Observation of Classroom Practice

Approach to observations

- 7.1 Assessment of trainee's classroom practice will be derived using observations undertaken by members of the ITE team.
- 7.2 The outcome of each observation is either:
- **Fail** - where learners progress is inadequate or learners are at risk. If an observer is required to intervene to maintain learner's wellbeing, this would automatically be a failed outcome. Where a failed outcome is recorded, this cannot be used by the trainee as one of their 8 observations and a re-observation is required.
 - **Pass** - where learners make at least satisfactory progress are not an unmanaged risk and the actions of the trainee have at least a generally positive impact on learners' progress.
 - **Pass Plus** - where learners make very good or excellent progress. The trainee's actions have a clear and overwhelmingly positive impact on learning, and a strong culture of learning is promoted in the classroom.
- 7.3 To successfully complete the programme the trainee must achieve a pass plus in at least one observation.
- 7.4 A successful observation is required in order for trainees to complete their reflective work and associated observation portfolio. However, the performance demonstrated

within an observation does not influence the academic outcome for the associated task.

Quality Assurance of Observations

- 7.4 ITE tutors who undertaken observations of trainee practice are required too dual observe with another ITE observer to standardise judgements.
- 7.5 ITE Observation reports are subject to moderation by the ITE team to ensure consistency
- 7.6 Observers new to the programme are provided with training from either the Programme Lead or the Head of Curriculum for ITE & Access and are required to undertake a minimum of 2 dual observations before being permitted to observe independently.
- 7.7 Observers are to provide verbal feedback to the trainee at the earliest possible convenience and provide a detailed written report and recommendations within 5 working days of the observation date.

Mentorship

- 7.8 Mentors provide a supportive role for trainees on the teacher training provision but are not directly involved in the assessment or grading of trainees.
- 7.9 Mentors function as a 'critical friend' for trainees and are expected to observe the trainee's classroom practice to effectively support the trainee's development. Trainees and mentors are provided with 'Mentor Meeting Records' which are used to capture the mentor's support and are included within the trainee's Observation Portfolios.
- 7.10 Mentors are encouraged to dual observe with ITE Observers wherever this is possible, however it is the ITE observer who is responsible for the production of the report and associated outcome of the observation.

- 7.11 Mentors are expected to produce a report at the end of the programme which provides feedback to the trainee on their progression through the programme and guidance beyond the programme

Professional Transition Report

- 7.11 On completion of the programme the ITE team will compile and produce a 'Professional Transition Report' for each trainee which summarises the trainee's achievements on the programme and provides feedback and guidance from both the ITE team and the trainee's mentor.
- 7.12 The Professional Transition Report is not an assessment or an assessment process but is a feedback mechanism and record capture to support the graduate in their journey as a newly qualified teacher.
- 7.13 The Professional Transition Report is provided to trainees upon completion of the programme and includes:
- i. The academic outcome from the programme following agreement at the summer exam board
 - ii. Outcomes of each of the trainee's formal observations conducted by the ITE team
 - iii. Feedback produced by the trainee's mentor at the end of the programme (see 7.11)
 - iv. Recommendations for continuing development from the ITE team for their first year as a newly qualified teacher

8.0 Board of Examiners

- 8.1 The board of examiners may, at its discretion, make such special arrangements as it deems appropriate in cases where it is not practicable for students to be reassessed in the same elements and by the same methods as at the first attempt. However, where a validated programme is discontinued, provision has to be made to ensure fair assessment opportunities for all students who have been enrolled.

8.2 Resit provision is subject to all the following conditions:

- (a) A student may re-sit the failed assessment components of a module only once.
Where there are extenuating circumstances, the Board of Examiners has discretion to decide whether a further assessment opportunity shall be permitted, unless explicitly prohibited in the rules for the programme, as approved in the validation process and programme specification.
- (b) A student who does not complete the resit by the date specified shall not progress the programme, except in cases where the process for allowing extenuating circumstances has been followed.
- (c) Resits can only take place after the meeting of the Board of Examiners or following agreement by the Chair and the External Examiner of the Board.
- (d) A student who successfully completes any required resits within a module shall be awarded the credit for the module and the result for the individual assessment component capped at the minimum pass mark for the module.
- (e) A student shall not be permitted to be reassessed by resit in any module that has received a pass mark, or in a component that has received a mark of 40% or above at UG level, or 50% at PG level.
- (f) The re-sit will normally be carried out by the same combination of written examination, coursework etc. as in the first attempt.
- (g) If a student does not successfully complete an allocated resit, it is within The Open University regulations that the resit Exam Board provide the candidate to complete a re-take of the module.

9.0 The Open University's Module Results Approval and Qualifications Classification Panel (MRAQCP).

- 9.1 All awards recommended by the board of examiners are ratified by The Open University's Module Results Approval and Qualifications Classification Panel (MRAQCP). The recommended awards and signed documentation must be sent to the MRAQCP within 2 days of the Exam Board taking place.
- 9.2 The MRAQCP panel has the authority of the OU Senate to ratify the recommendations of all Examination Award Boards (EAB) after satisfying itself that the recommendations have been determined with due regard to the approved regulations, that the correct procedures have been followed and that the appropriate

academic standards have been upheld. This Panel has the authority of the OU Senate to overrule any result recommendation which is contrary to approved regulations.

- 9.3 All results provided on module feedback are provisional pending approval and adjustment from the exam board. Final outcomes are published only when South Essex College has received confirmation that the outcomes of the exam board have been ratified by The Open University

End of Policy

Senior Leadership Responsibility	Adam Fahey - Deputy Chief Executive - Curriculum and Quality
Policy Author	Matthew Twitchett - Executive Director Quality, Teaching and Learning.
Roles Responsible for Reviewing	Executive Director Quality, Teaching and Learning.
Issue date of current version	18-9-24 (26-27 V1)
Date to be reviewed	August 2027
Type of Policy	Public

