

Global Banking School
+44 (0) 207 539 3548
info@globalbanking.ac.uk
www.globalbanking.ac.uk
891 Greenford Road, London
UB6 0HE

GBS Assessment and Feedback Policy

Document title	GBS Assessment and Feedback Policy
Partnership applicable to	All GBS Provision
Version	V1.5
Approved by (Oversight Committee)	Academic Board
Policy lead (Staff member accountable)	Provost
Date of original approval	January 2023
Date of last review	June 2026
Changes made at the last review:	Inclusion of Pearson specific elements into the policy. Minor editorial changes.
Date effective from	July 2026
Date of next review	July 2027
Related GBS policies	
• GBS Student Charter • GBS Student Code of Conduct • GBS Good Academic Practice and Academic Conduct Policy and Procedure • GBS Learning and Teaching Policy • GBS Student Complaints Policy and Procedure • GBS Student Protection Plan • GBS Student Conduct Policy • GBS Equality and Diversity Policy • GBS Anti-Harassment and Anti-Bullying Policy – Students • GBS Recognition of Prior Learning Policy • GBS Registration, Entry and Certification Policy • GBS Extenuating Circumstances Policy • GBS Academic Appeals Policy • GBS Admissions Policy • GBS Student Engagement and Attendance Policy • GBS Fitness to Study Policy • GBS Safeguarding Policy • GBS Student Terms and Conditions	
External Reference Points	
1. UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Advice and Guidance: Concerns, Complaints and Appeals and Advice and Guidance: Partnerships. 2. OIAHE Good Practice Framework, Handling Complaints and Academic Appeals. 3. Pearson, <i>BTEC Centre Guide to Quality Assurance</i> 4. Pearson, <i>Delivering BTEC qualifications, BTEC forms and guides</i>, Accessed online at: https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/delivering-our-qualifications/delivering-btec-qualifications/btec-forms-and-guides.html	

1. Purpose

- 1.1** The UK Quality Code for Higher Education requires higher education providers to ensure academic standards and quality through the consistent operation of assessment processes which are equitable, valid, reliable and fair. Moreover, consistent and equitable practice is essential to the integrity of assessment processes and to the comparability of students' expectations and experience.
- 1.2** Assessment is a key element of student learning and is the principal mechanism for ensuring academic standards are met and for measuring student achievement against those standards. Global Banking School (GBS) expects that:
- Assessment methods and criteria are aligned to learning outcomes and teaching activities.
 - Assessment is reliable, consistent, fair, and valid.
 - Assessment design is approached holistically.
 - Assessment is inclusive and equitable.
 - Assessment is explicit and transparent.
 - Assessment and feedback are meaningful, specific and support the learning process.
 - Feedback is provided in a timely fashion.
 - Assessment is efficient and manageable.
 - Students are supported and prepared for assessment.
 - Assessment encourages academic integrity.
- 1.3** This policy is applicable to all taught provision of GBS that leads to the award of a degree or other credit of GBS itself and of Pearson (HNC/D programmes). This policy will not always apply, in part or in full, to programmes validated or franchised under third party partnership agreements, where specific regulations, policies and procedures of the partner may, as agreed with the partner, apply and take precedence.
- 1.4** This policy is aligned with the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education.
- 1.5** This policy is aligned with the Pearson BTEC Higher Nationals Centre Guide Quality Assurance and Assessment Handbook for Pearson programmes.

2. Assessment Design Principles

2.1 Assessment must be designed to:

- Encourage a high standard and depth of learning through authentic, reliable, and engaging tasks that reflect real-life applications and support employability.
- Be inclusive and accessible, offering a diverse range of assessment types and formats, with clear instructions and support for different learning styles, disabilities, and the use of assistive technologies.
- Be consistent in level and challenge across comparable modules, supporting equality, diversity, inclusion, and social justice by representing students' identities and experiences.

- Achieve a balanced integration of formative and summative assessments, focusing on attainment in learning areas, providing opportunities for reflection on feedback, and supporting ongoing development.
- Incorporate guidance on the ethical use of generative AI, ensuring academic integrity and reducing opportunities for misconduct.
- Be thoughtfully designed with consideration for students' time and mental wellbeing, including dedicated time and checkpoints to gauge progress.
- Involve meaningful student voice and co-production, allowing learners to participate in assessment-related decision-making.

2.2 Assessment must be designed to: Assessment should be integrated with learning and must align with specified learning outcomes for the module and programme. Assessment criteria should be directly related to learning outcomes and include skills, knowledge, and attributes that support future employment. For more information on learning outcomes, see the Academic Standards and Quality Manual, Section 1 – Credit Framework.

2.3 Assessment design must comply with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and the requirements of relevant Professional, Statutory, and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs). For Pearson programmes, assessment design must additionally comply with Pearson's qualification specifications and the Pearson Regulations.

3. Responsibilities

- 3.1** Academic Board has overall responsibility for setting and maintaining academic standards, and for assuring the quality of all GBS provision.
- 3.2** The Academic Standard and Quality Committee is responsible for ensuring that Global Banking School's (GBS) quality assurance processes are fit for purpose and meet internal and external requirements, including but not limited to the OfS' Ongoing Conditions of Registration and requirements under the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.
- 3.3** The Learning and Teaching Committee is responsible for the development, monitoring and review of strategies and approaches to learning and teaching and to review and operationalise GBS's Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy. The Committee has oversight of learning, teaching and assessment across all GBS programmes and partnerships.
- 3.4** The purpose of the Progression and Award Board is to make decisions about student progression and student award outcomes.
- 3.5** Module Boards confirm a student's performance and/or achievement at modular level. Confirmed module marks are reported to the Progression and Awards Board so that student progression and award decisions may be made.
- 3.6** Programme Committees are responsible for maintaining academic standards and the quality of the students' learning experience in the programmes for which the committees are responsible.
- 3.7** Academic staff are responsible for designing, conducting, and marking assessments, and providing feedback in ways that are inclusive, facilitate

effective learning and measure student achievement. In designing assessments, they are responsible for ensuring that quality assurance and quality enhancement input from the Centre for Academic Excellence is considered.

- 3.8** External Examiners are responsible for determining whether the standard of academic work produced by students of GBS is comparable to similar programmes at other higher education institutions and to safeguard academic integrity. This is achieved by testing the robustness of the assessment processes, ascertaining that students are treated fairly within these processes, and by reporting systematically and objectively to the relevant Faculty.

4. Award of Qualifications

- 4.1** Awards of GBS are based on demonstrable achievement of defined learning outcomes at each required level of study, as set out in the Programme Specification, consistent with the relevant national qualification frameworks' descriptors.
- 4.2** All Learning Outcomes for a module must be assessed to determine the extent to which students achieve the learning outcomes both at, and beyond, the threshold level.

5. Language of Assessments

- 5.1** All assessments shall be conducted in English.

6. Communicating Assessment Requirements

- 6.1** Students will be advised of assessment requirements for their programme in full at the start of each semester or period of study. This will include the form and weighting of each assessment together with an indication of submission deadlines and/or time-constrained assessment periods.
- 6.2** Students will be provided with clear and sufficient information to enable effective planning of workloads in relation to assessment requirements. For each module, detailed assessment requirements will be published in module handbooks and on the virtual learning environment. Explicit instructions for each assessment task must be set out, ensuring that the guidance is appropriate to the academic level and does not provide excessive scaffolding, thereby supporting independent learning and development.

7. Assessment Criteria, Rubrics and Grade Descriptors

7.1 Assessment Criteria Publication and Accessibility

Clear assessment criteria will be published to students for each assessment task, using explicit and accessible language. Criteria must:

- Be mapped to the intended learning outcomes and aligned with grade descriptors. They should clearly indicate the weighting of each component and the overall contribution of the assessment to the module grade. Responsibility for this mapping rests with the Module Leader, and the Associate Dean must verify compliance.

- Identify what students are expected to do to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes, with expectations and support matched to the appropriate academic level.
- Provide sufficient guidance to clarify requirements, but avoid excessive scaffolding, ensuring students are challenged appropriately for their stage of study.
- Be accessible to all students, with language and format that supports understanding across diverse backgrounds and abilities.

7.2 Wherever possible, assessment criteria should be supported by the use of rubrics. Rubrics are typically constructed as grids that contain the assessment criteria and define the expected standards for different levels of judgement. To ensure transparency and consistency in the assessment process, it is essential that all staff and students are clearly informed about which version of the rubric applies to each assessment task. Used effectively, rubrics help students identify the standards of work required for different grades and promote a shared understanding of expectations.

7.3 The adoption of assessment criteria and the use of rubrics will be underpinned by reference to the relevant grade descriptors. The grade descriptors are a key point of reference that provide a benchmark in relation to the standard of students' work across grade bands. The grade descriptors promote consistency across modules and programmes.

8. Submission

8.1 Electronic Submission

8.1.1 The standard mode for submission of coursework is electronic, via the virtual learning environment platforms. The facilities for electronic submission will be established specifically within each module site on the virtual learning environment, and the arrangements will be clearly communicated to students. Where there is an exemption from the requirement for electronic submission, this must be communicated to students in the relevant module handbook and on the virtual learning environment.

8.2 Anonymous marking

8.2.1 To protect students from unfair or partial assessment and staff from accusations of bias, anonymous marking must be used in assessing all coursework and examinations, including essays, reports, laboratory work and field work, save where this is not possible (for example, in live oral language examinations, dissertations and group work).

8.2.2 It is acknowledged that there are forms of assessment where anonymity is not possible or practicable. There are also situations where anonymity may be compromised due to the individual nature of the assessment task, or where provisions have been made for an individual student's circumstances.

8.2.3 Where there is an exemption to anonymous assessment, this must be communicated to students in the relevant module handbook and on the virtual learning environment.

- 8.2.4** Where assessments are not marked anonymously, steps must be taken to give students confidence in the consistency and impartiality of the process. This will include the use of clear assessment criteria, rubrics and grade descriptors.
- 8.2.5** Where a marker suspects a case of academic misconduct, anonymity is to be lifted for an investigation to take place.

9. Assessments

9.1 An assessment may serve one or more of three broad functions, namely:

- Diagnostic – to determine how well a learner is prepared for a given programme of study or module and identifying gaps which can then be addressed.
- Formative – designed to help learners learn more effectively by giving them feedback on their performance and how performance can be improved and/or maintained.
- Summative – measuring the extent of a learner's achievement in meeting the assessment criteria and contributing to the final results for a level or the programme as a whole.

9.2 The function of the assessment must be set out clearly for students.

10. Formative Activities and Assessment

- 10.1** Before any summative assessment(s) students must be given the opportunity to evaluate their learning and to receive feedback designed to assist them to improve their learning. Formative activities and formative assessment provide students with developmental support in a timely manner so that they have a real opportunity to improve their performance. It helps students to take greater responsibility for their own learning, to understand what constitutes good performance, and to foster a shared understanding between staff and students as to how academic judgements are made.
- 10.2** Formative feedback can take various forms, including tutor-provided feedback, tutor-guided self-assessment, peer assessment and whole-class feedback. It is expected that each module will have several formative activities throughout the teaching period, which shall include at least one formative assessment where personalised feedback is provided.
- 10.3** Feedback from formative activities carried out in class must be provided immediately during the activity, and reinforced in writing, normally via the online forum in the virtual learning environment. Written feedback on formative assessments should be provided within 5 working days of submission, and always in sufficient time for students to act on it before the related summative assessment is due. At least one formative activity must include written feedback for students.

11. Summative Assessment

11.1 Assessment Design

- 11.1.1** Assessments must be designed to reflect their intended function and the learning outcomes of both the module and the overall programme, in accordance with the principles set out in section 2. Assessment design

should take into account relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statements and PSRB requirements. Assessments must be fair, equitable, and inclusive, providing all students with level-appropriate rigour and stretch and a meaningful platform to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and understanding.

- 11.1.2** Academic misconduct of any kind is unacceptable (see section 14). As far as possible, all assessments should be designed to minimise the opportunities for students to deliberately cheat and to minimise the risk of encouraging behaviours that may lead students to inadvertent cheating, for example through group plagiarism or misuse of generative AI. Assessments should promote authentic engagement and allow students to demonstrate their thinking in visible, personalised ways.

11.2 Volume of Summative Assessments

- 11.2.1** Each module of study shall normally be 20 Credit Hours in value (15 Credits for Pearson Units). Each Credit Hour shall normally have ten hours of learning and teaching time. The remaining hours of study required shall comprise directed learning and self-study time. The time required for students to complete an assessment shall be included within time allocated for directed learning.
- 11.2.2** Module volume of assessment (individual): the total volume of assessment for each module should not normally exceed three hours of assessment for a 20 Credit hour module, or equivalent for modules of different Credit value. For coursework assignments, each hour of assessment should typically equate to 750 – 1,000 words, or a 20 – 30-minute presentation. For group assessments each individual is expected to contribute an amount that is comparable to that required in an equivalent individual assessment.

11.3 Number of Summative Assessments

- 11.3.1** Faculties must be mindful of assessment loading across modules, academic levels and programmes. Assessment loading should be relative to credit. Module learning outcomes should not be over-assessed by multiple assessed elements, and the following assessment loading guidelines should normally be followed:
- 20 credits: one assessment element
 - 30 credits: one or two assessment elements

11.4 Types of Summative Assessments

- 11.4.1** It is encouraged that a mixed method of assessment, as appropriate to the nature of individual programmes, is used. Types of assessment that may be used include:
- Written Exam
 - Open Book Exam
 - Computer Based Exam
 - Group Coursework with individual accountability
 - Reflective Assignment/Professional Journal
 - Case Study
 - Review / Critical Review

- Written Coursework
- Work-Based Problem or Incident Analysis
- Live External Brief (Organisation or Community Partner)
- Written Report
- Work Placement Report
- Dissertation
- Portfolio with process evidence/iterative milestones
- Digital Artefact
- Group Practical
- Technical Skills / Practical Skills Demonstration/Assessment
- Individual Presentation
- Oral Assessment of a written Artefact
- Professional Discussion/Viva Voce

11.5 Group Assessments

11.5.1 Student participation in assessed group work

- 11.5.1.1** The purpose and educational rationale for assessed group work (including the benefits of group working skills) should be explained to students in advance of participation, including an explanation of how such activities contribute to the intended learning outcomes of the module and the function of the assessment.
- 11.5.1.2** No student should be disadvantaged through the use of assessed group work, and tutors should ensure that mechanisms are available to enable all students to take a full and active part in the group activities and processes.
- 11.5.1.3** Tutors should make reasonable adjustments for students with a declared disability to enable fair and reasonable assessment of the learning outcomes being assessed by group-based activities.
- 11.5.1.4** Students should be given sufficient advance notice of planned assessed group activities to help them to prepare and to raise any queries or concerns at an early stage. For certain students, it may be necessary to consider alternative ways of meeting the learning outcomes in cases where, even with additional support, the student would be unable to interact appropriately with other students and contribute to the group task (particularly where this might have an adverse impact on their own performance and/or the performance of other students). Alternative forms of assessment should ensure that learning outcomes continue to be met and might include additional individual written work and/or presentations on a one-to-one basis with the lecturer.
- 11.5.1.5** Procedures for students to be able to raise concerns with lecturers about group member involvement should be communicated to students in advance of participation.

11.5.2 The marking of group work

- 11.5.2.1** Lecturers and students should be confident that the assessment of an individual's contribution to the group work activity is fair. The methods by

which group work will be marked, and associated marking criteria, should be transparent to students and fully justified in the assignment brief. This should make clear the proportion (if any) of the final mark that will be common to all group members, and the proportion that will be allocated on an individual basis. All assessed work undertaken by group work should enable students to demonstrate their achievement of all associated learning outcomes.

- 11.5.2.2** The involvement and contribution of each individual student should be evident to those assessing the work where the assessed group work leads to a group-based mark. Normally, marks awarded in common to groups of students should not constitute more than 50% of the overall module mark, unless there is a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirement that a higher proportion is used.
- 11.5.2.3** The marking process may be informed through group negotiation of marks or by peer review activities. Such practice should be clearly explained to students, including the provision of transparent marking criteria, with lecturer support and guidance available where appropriate.
- 11.5.2.4** While lecturers may choose to employ group negotiation or peer feedback techniques to help determine marks, the final marks awarded will be wholly determined by lecturers. Lecturers have the right to discount student input where, based on sound evidence, they conclude individuals have been unfairly judged or treated within the assessment processes.

11.6 Work-based learning (WBL): Assessments

- 11.6.1** Assessment strategies should support student learning, reinforce the relevance of the WBL activity, and offer a range of opportunities to demonstrate achievement of academic standards.
- 11.6.2** Faculties should consider the degree to which the WBL provider is involved in assessment, and how this will be managed to ensure the intended learning outcomes are accurately and fairly assessed. It is essential that all parties involved in formal assessment are qualified and competent to carry out their roles.
- 11.6.3** The extent of the WBL provider's role in assessment should be clear and conveyed to the student and WBL provider. Where the provider is expected to contribute towards the assessment of the student, the Faculty should provide clear guidelines, marking criteria and training/support as appropriate.
- 11.6.4** A range of different methods can be used to assess achievement as a result of work-based learning; the choice will link to the specific learning outcomes and whether the focus is on the content of learning, the process of learning or both.
 - *Reflective writing:* often formative rather than summative and should promote reflection on the learning undertaken.
 - *Assignments and projects:* any task must be directly linked to the student's work content and context and, as with all assessment, include clear criteria.
 - *Reports:* these can relate to distinct aspects of the work-based learning and can be designed to develop the skills of writing as well as measure the veracity of the content.

- *Portfolios*: portfolio assessment comprises a focussed collection of work and can be used to achieve two distinct purposes: a developmental portfolio if organised to show student learning or a showcase portfolio if based on samples of a student's best work. Ideally the student will be involved both in selecting the work and deciding the criteria that are used to judge the work. In addition, the portfolio should include evidence of student self-reflection on the content and process.

11.6.5 The assessment of WBL will be subject to standard moderation and external examining procedures.

11.6.6 In cases where a student is unable to complete the WBL experience because of the Work Based Learning provider withdrawing from the arrangement or other circumstances beyond the control of the student, the Faculty must look to provide an alternative opportunity to demonstrate achievement of the relevant learning outcomes.

11.7 Scheduling of Assessments

11.7.1 The scheduling of assessments should be carefully planned, to avoid assignment bunching, allow sufficient time for formative feedback to be given and reflected on before subsequent assessments, and enable students the time to prepare adequately. Feedback on summative assessments should be given within 15 days of submission of the work and includes time for second marking and internal moderation.

11.7.2 Assessment schedules should be provided to students in advance and no later than at the start of each module. Once provided to students, assessment schedules should not be varied except in exceptional and unforeseeable circumstances.

11.8. Feedback: Pre-summative assessment guidance

11.8.1 To maintain the integrity of the assessment process and ensure equity across students, pre-submission support should focus on the development of independent learning. Staff must ensure that feedback does not provide specific content instructions or interventions that would pre-empt the formal consideration of a student's independent, summative work. This ensures that the final submission remains an authentic reflection of the student's own achievement. Staff are encouraged to provide feedback that clarifies assessment criteria and enables a shared understanding of academic expectations.

11.9 Feedback: Post-summative assessment guidance

11.9.1 Feedback provided after the submission and marking of summative assessments should explain why the student received the specific mark, clearly linking strengths and weaknesses to the published assessment criteria, learning outcomes, and marking rubric. Where appropriate, staff may offer general advice on skills or approaches that will benefit performance in future assessments. For guidance on how to provide comprehensive feedback, including depth and quantity, please refer to the GBS Feedback Good Practice Guide.

11.10 Marking and Moderation

11.10.1 Marking should normally be undertaken by an academic staff member who taught the module. However, to maintain impartiality, lecturers must mark

each other's students' work so that no lecturer assesses the work of students they personally taught.

- 11.10.2** A random but representative sample of student work plus all borderline fails shall be moderated. The sample of work moderated shall be representative of the distribution of grades awarded by markers and be drawn from work marked at each campus.
- 11.10.3** The sample size of work to be moderated shall normally be 10% of the total cohort or 10 scripts, whichever is greater. Exceptions to this general rule may be required, for example where relevant PSRBs dictate otherwise, or where the first marker is inexperienced (in which instance it might be deemed necessary to moderate a greater proportion of work).
- 11.10.4** Moderation is undertaken for the purpose of ensuring:
- Objectivity of marking.
 - Appropriate standards have been applied.
 - Fairness and equity across all campus locations.
- 11.10.5** The Moderator shall be a senior academic, who shall mark the sample of student work independently of the initial marker. The Moderator must not have been involved in any of the initial marking of scripts. The Moderator shall either:
- (a) Confirm the marks awarded; or, as appropriate,
 - (b) Reconsider the marks given to the entire cohort of students and, as a consequence, make changes to all marks, for example by scaling up or down the whole cohort; or
 - (c) Reconsider the marks for sub-sections of the cohort.
- 11.10.6** Where the Moderator has made changes to the marks, the Moderator shall submit the initial and revised marks to the Associate Dean (Assessment), along with the reasons for the changes made. The revised marks shall be submitted to the Module/Interim Board along with a report from the Associate Dean (Assessment) detailing the changes made and the reason(s) for the changes.
- 11.10.7** The Module/Interim Board shall make the final determination of the module marks awarded.

11.11 Double Marking

- 11.11.1** The moderation process (see section 11.10) provides the necessary assurance of consistency and fairness across the majority of modes of assessment and double marking is used only where it is specifically required by a PSRB or when it is not possible to use sample moderation, for example in the case of Master's dissertations.
- 11.11.2** Double marking is the process by which a piece of work is marked by two assessors, who agree a final mark for the purpose of classification.
- 11.11.3** Where the two markers are unable to agree the final mark, they shall refer the matter to the Associate Dean (Assessment), who shall adjudicate.

11.12 Module Grades

- 11.12.1** Each element of an assessment should be given a numeric mark that reflects the achievement of the student mapped against GBS grade descriptors. Module marks shall be the appropriately weighted average of the marks given for each element of assessment. The module mark shall be stated as a percentage of the total marks available for the module.
- 11.12.2** The pass mark for a module shall be that stated in the academic regulations. Unless otherwise stated in the module specification, the weighted average mark for the module shall determine whether a student has passed that module. In some cases, it may also be necessary to pass specific components of a module in order to be awarded a pass in that module (for example where required by PSRBs): in such cases this must be made explicit in the module specification and the marking criteria.
- 11.12.3** Except where a module is pass/fail only, students shall be informed of their mark (given as a percentage according to the requirements) for each assignment and for each module. Any marks awarded are provisional until confirmed by the Module/Interim Board. Provisional marks for summative assessments should be given to students as soon as possible, and not more than 15 days after the conclusion of the assessment, making it clear that the marks are provisional and may be amended, up or down, by the Module/Interim Board. Once confirmed by the Board, confirmed marks shall be formally communicated to students as soon as possible, but not more than 10 days following the Module/Interim Board.

11.13 Standardisation

- 11.13.1** Standardisation sets the standards of marking required and is led by the module leader. Prior to the standardisation meeting, a minimum of 3 pieces of work are selected by the module leader to represent the spectrum of achievements within each module. These pieces of student work are marked by every lecturer who will complete first marking. In the standardisation meeting, the first marking team review the spectrum of grades and feedback for the student work and the module leader sets the marking standards which all lecturers must follow to promote fairness and consistency.

11.14 External Examiners

- 11.14.1** The principal role of External Examiners at GBS is to determine whether the standard of academic work produced by students of GBS is comparable to similar programmes at other higher education institutions and to safeguard academic integrity. This is achieved by testing the robustness of the assessment processes, ascertaining that students are treated fairly within these processes, and by reporting systematically and objectively to the relevant Faculty.
- 11.14.2** The External Examiners are required to make a set of core judgements which will assist the Faculty in:
- verifying by reference to relevant indicators (for example, the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and subject benchmark statements) that the academic standard set for each award is appropriate to its level;

- confirming that, in measuring the standard of student achievement in each award, it is comparable with other higher education institutions offering an award at the same level;
- determining that there is congruence between the stated learning outcomes of each programme and its assessment methods; ensuring that all aspects of the assessment process are conducted fairly, consistently, and accurately in accordance with programme and GBS's Academic Regulations.

11.14.3 In addition, External Examiners are required to carry out the duties that will enable them to fulfil the role, as summarised below:

11.14.4 Curricula, assessment design:

- ensure the programmes/modules are coherent and are in alignment with internal and external frameworks;
- comment and provide advice on matters of curriculum content, balance and structure, in so far as these affect the programme academic structure;
- scrutinise and approve the draft assessment requirements and ensure that assessment criteria and marking schemes are set at an appropriate level.

11.14.5 Assessment and marking:

- moderate the sample of internally marked and moderated work in accordance with GBS's Assessment and Feedback Policy;
- moderate a representative sample of 5% of assessments;
- comment on all assessments sampled (including examination papers), and practical assignments such as dissertations, extended essays, or projects in advance of completion of the assessment;
- assure themselves that GBS is maintaining academic standards and rigour in its marking. External Examiners should not change individual marks but should alert the Faculty Dean where there are concerns regarding the overall standard of marking.

11.14.6 Progression and Awards Board:

- confirm that they agree with the proposed marks by GBS and awards presented to the Progression and Awards Board;
- attend meetings of Progression and Awards Board. Where scheduling of Progression and Awards Boards will cause difficulties for an External Examiner to attend (either virtually or in person), the External Examiner should liaise in a timely manner to explore whether alternative scheduling could be arranged;
- assure themselves that GBS's procedures have been applied fairly and equitably and any decisions made by the Progression and Awards Board are consistent with those procedures.

11.14.7 External Examiner Reports:

- produce an annual report providing recommendations and highlighting good practice as appropriate on the conduct of the assessment processes, academic standards, assessment, and the curriculum design and delivery;
- satisfy themselves that GBS has given due consideration to any recommendations given in the previous year's Report, with any actions or rationale for the status quo noted.

11.14.8 External Examiners need not be routinely engaged in level 4, unless required to by professional body expectations. Instead, Externals should be offered the opportunity to request to view level 4 assessment instruments and sample work if they have concerns.

11.14.9 For further information on nominating and appointing External Examiners, please see Section 7 of the Academic Standards and Quality Manual.

11.15 Resit opportunities

11.15.1 Students who fail a module may be offered the opportunity to resit or retake the module in part, or in full, as set out in the relevant academic regulations. Any work submitted by a student as part of any resitting or retaking of an assessment (or part thereof), shall be marked as if it were a first attempt; any capping or other adjustments that may be applied to reassessments shall be carried out at the Module/Interim Board.

11.15.2 Students who pass a module are not permitted any further attempts/reattempts in that module.

11.16 Repeat opportunities (Pearson only)

11.16.1 Pearson awards operate a Repeat Opportunities policy. The following applies to all students following a Pearson programme:

- Any Pearson student who has failed a unit following both a first attempt and a resubmission may, at the discretion of the Progression and Awards Board, repeat the unit.
- To be considered for a repeat opportunity, the student must have made a reasonable attempt at the unit.
- The student must adhere to the standard attendance requirements for the repeat opportunity.
- The student must pay the full fee for the repeat unit as determined by Finance.
- If the student successfully meets the learning outcomes for the unit, the mark for the repeat unit will be capped at a Pass.
- A student can only repeat a unit once.
- Any evidence previously produced by the student for the unit being repeated that did meet the Pass criteria remains valid and may be used for assignments within the repeat unit. Students who are repeating a unit only need to generate evidence for any Pass criteria that they did not achieve in their previous submissions.

12. Diagnostic Assessment

12.1 GBS may use assessments to determine how well a learner is prepared for a given programme of study or module and identify gaps which can then be addressed. Such assessments are referred to as diagnostic assessments.

13. Students with Disabilities

- 13.1** In the design and delivery of the curriculum, full and proper consideration must be given to ensuring that assessments are accessible for students with declared disabilities.
- 13.2** Reasonable adjustments to the assessments and their conduct should be made to afford disabled students the same opportunities as their peers to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes. This may involve adjusting the type, scheduling or marking of the assessment in the context of maintenance of academic standards.
- 13.3** Reasonable adjustments to assessment practices should:
- recognise the needs of disabled students with a range of conditions, including physical and mobility difficulties, hearing loss, visual impairments, specific learning difficulties including dyslexia, medical conditions and mental ill health;
 - be widely publicised in an accessible format and easy for students to follow;
 - operate with minimum delay;
 - allow flexibility in the conduct of the assessment;
 - not be dependent on students' individual funding arrangements;
 - be agreed with individual students and all appropriate parties.
- 13.4** Inclusive assessment practices are designed to reduce the need for individual adjustments by proactively removing barriers for all students. However, reasonable adjustments to meet individual needs must be available and accessible to any student who requires them, regardless of whether they have registered with Disability Services or have a formal support plan. Identification and implementation of adjustments should be responsive to individual circumstances and informed by dialogue with the student, Disability Services, and relevant staff.
- 13.5** Further information and guidance are available from Student Welfare.

14. Academic Misconduct

- 14.1** Academic misconduct of any kind is unacceptable. Assessments should be designed to help students succeed while protecting academic integrity and to minimise the opportunities for students to deliberately cheat. Those marking student work should be vigilant and any suspected academic misconduct should be referred through the **GBS Good Academic Practice and Academic Conduct Policy and Procedure**.

15. Extenuating Circumstances

- 15.1** GBS recognises that, on occasion, circumstances beyond the control and reasonable foresight of a student may negatively impact on their performance

in an assessment. Such circumstances are covered by the **GBS Extenuating Circumstances Policy**.

- 15.2** Faculties must provide clear guidance to students on how they should apply for consideration of mitigating circumstances, when they should submit their application, how their request will be considered and what types of circumstances constitute 'mitigating circumstances', as set out in the **Extenuating Circumstances Policy**.

PEARSON HNC/D SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

(Standardisation and Internal Verification of Teaching and Assessment for Pearson Programmes)

This Part applies exclusively to students enrolled on Pearson BTEC Higher National Certificate (HNC) and Higher National Diploma (HND) programmes and to all staff involved in the delivery, assessment and internal verification of those programmes. Where any provision in this Part conflicts with a provision in sections 1–15, this Part shall take precedence for Pearson programmes.

16. Standardisation and Internal Verification (Pearson Programmes)

- 16.1** This Part provides guidance to academic and professional staff on standardisation and internal verification of teaching, assignment briefs, assessment grading/marking, and the provision of high-quality feedback for Pearson programmes. It must be read alongside the GBS General Academic Regulations for programmes leading to Pearson Awards and in conjunction with Pearson requirements.

- 16.2** BTEC HND programmes are operated according to the Pearson BTEC Centre Guide to Quality Assurance and Assessment. As an approved Pearson Centre, GBS has devolved responsibility for teaching and assessment, monitored through the Pearson Academic Management Review and External Examiner processes.

16.3 Pearson Roles and Responsibilities

In addition to the roles set out in section 3, the following roles apply to Pearson programmes:

Quality Nominee – Academic Quality Manager	Main point of contact with Pearson; responsible for effective delivery of HND qualifications, centre policies and procedures, qualification approval, and accuracy of public information.
Cohort Lead / Lead Internal Verifier	Co-ordinates standardisation activities to ensure consistency in assessment decisions; provides guidance and support for assessors and internal verifiers; ensures assessment planning, deadlines, procedures for resubmissions,

	extensions, and extenuating circumstances are followed; co-ordinates and monitors internal verification across all units and assessors; ensures assignment briefs and assessment decisions are internally verified before being issued or confirmed (considering reasonable adjustments).
Module Leader	Acts as internal verifier for the unit/module; responsible for teaching materials; ensures formative and summative assessment is successful.
Assessor	Responsible for assessing students; delivers the programme of study; assesses evidence produced by students against the assessment criteria in the programme specification (considering reasonable adjustments); accountable for marking and grading submissions and resubmissions.
Internal Verifier	Conducts quality checks on assessment processes and practice to ensure they meet national standards and that all students have been judged fairly and consistently. Internal Verifiers do not verify their own work; they verify each other's in line with Pearson requirements, and must have prior knowledge and experience of IV processes.

16.4 A formal log of potential and actual conflicts of interest will be kept up to date within GBS, including actions taken to minimise risk, in line with Pearson requirements. These will be made available to Pearson on request. Examples of conflicts of interest include a close relation, spouse or partner who is either a student or another member of staff, or a close relation acting as an External Examiner or in another external quality assurance role.

16.5 Teaching, Schemes of Work and Learning Materials (Pearson)

To ensure a positive learning experience, teaching for Pearson programmes must be fully planned according to GBS and Pearson requirements.

16.6 Schemes of Work set out the teaching material, sequence of topics, learning outcomes and related matters for each unit. They must be produced on the GBS Scheme of Work template by the Unit Lead and signed off by the Level Lead.

16.7 Unit Leads must hold a standardisation meeting to ensure all staff delivering the unit follow the same Scheme of Work and that requirements are clear across all campuses.

16.8 Each teaching session in the Scheme of Work must have lecture notes and learning support materials uploaded to the GBS VLE. The Unit Lead is responsible for production, upload (subject to Level Lead approval), and keeping material current.

16.9 Assignment Briefs (Pearson)

Percentage-based grading and multiple-choice assessments are not used in Pearson BTEC Higher Nationals. The following process must be followed for Pearson assignment briefs:

- The Module Leader refers to the Programme Assessment Methods form for the stated assessment methods for the specific unit.

- The Module Leader refers to the Programme Assessment Plan for the unit, gaining all required details (brief submission date, hand-out date, stated Internal Verifier and Assessors).
- The Module Leader produces the Assignment Brief referring to the relevant Programme Specification. All Assignment Briefs must use the approved template and the font style Arial, size 12.
- The Assignment Brief is internally verified to ensure Pearson requirements are met. Internal verification is carried out by a member of staff with appropriate experience as stated in the Assessment Plan.
- Once approved, the brief is issued to students, and the brief and grading scheme are issued to other teachers of the module.
- Prior to a unit starting, the Module Lead organises an “Understanding the Assignment Brief” meeting for all lecturers teaching the unit, to ensure shared understanding of assessment methods and approach.

As IV Lead for each programme, the Level Lead approves and signs off each Assignment Brief.

16.10 Formative Feedback (Pearson)

All students on Pearson programmes will undertake a minimum of four formative tasks in every unit delivered. These are set by the Unit Leader, provide feedback on progress, and each learner must be given the opportunity to receive feedback on at least one Learning Outcome. Weekly formative tasks are undertaken and submitted on the Moodle VLE.

16.11 Standardisation of Marking (Pearson)

Where there is more than one marker for student assessed work, standardisation between markers must take place before marking starts. The Unit Leader produces and distributes marking guidance. Samples of unmarked student work are selected and given to the tutors marking the module assessment; the samples are marked independently, and marks/grades are then exchanged and agreed for each sampled piece. When sufficient consistency is established, tutors may commence marking their allocation.

16.12 Internal Verification of Assessment Decisions (Pearson)

Once all marking for the module assessment has taken place and feedback has been provided, a sample of assessed work must be internally verified for Pearson awards. Internal Verification must be valid, reliable, open, fair and free from bias; cover every unit, every assessor, every assignment, every assessment site, and the full range of student achievement (Pass, Merit, Distinction, Unclassified/Referred); and be supported by accurate and detailed records.

16.13 The following process applies:

- Internal Verification of student assignments is carried out on a risk based approach, there is no fixed sample size. Sampling should reflect the range of assessment decisions and consider Assessor experience, with increased sampling where risk is higher. Although not all students need to be sampled, it is good practice to include as wide and representative a range of work as possible.
- An Internal Verifier is allocated to one unit across all cohorts.

- The process is overseen by the Internal Verification Lead / Level Lead and the Cohort Lead.
- Internal Verification of assessment decisions is carried out by a staff member familiar with BTEC assessment at the appropriate level and with subject knowledge of the programme area.
- Where there is agreement between the first grade awarded and the Internal Verifier, no adjustments are required. Where there is disagreement, a discussion between the assessor and Internal Verifier must take place and be documented on the Internal Verification of Decisions Assessment Form.
- Feedback from the Internal Verifier to the Assessor must comment on the quality of feedback to the student and the effective completion of documentation and include developmental feedback (e.g. annotation of assessment evidence to show where grades are achieved). All Internal Verification of assessed work must be clearly recorded. Where the Internal Verifier requires action, the Assessor completes it and returns it to the Internal Verifier for review and sign off.

16.14 External Examining (Pearson)

The External Examiner for Pearson programmes will request an assessment sample, which must be provided within the timescales agreed with the Examiner. Any recommendations arising from External Examiner visits must be followed to the agreed timescales.

16.15 Grading (Pearson)

The grading of BTEC Higher National qualifications is at unit and qualification level. Each successfully completed unit will be graded as Pass, Merit or Distinction:

- Pass: awarded for the achievement of all outcomes against the specified assessment criteria.
- Merit and Distinction grades are awarded for higher-level achievement.
- Refer: evidence has not satisfied the Pass criteria at the first attempt.

16.16 Assessment decisions for BTEC Higher Nationals are based on the specific assessment criteria given in each unit and set at each level of attainment in that unit and at the qualification level. The criteria are defined within a framework to ensure standards are consistent in the qualification and across the suite as a whole. Assessors show how they have reached their decisions using the criteria in the Unit descriptor. When a student has completed all assessments for a unit, the assessment team awards a grade based on the highest level the student is judged to have met for all the criteria.

16.17 Final Grade Determination:

- To achieve a Pass, a student will have satisfied all the Pass criteria for the learning outcomes, showing coverage of the unit content and therefore attainment at Level 4 or 5 of the national framework.
- To achieve a Merit, a student will have satisfied all the Merit criteria (and the Pass criteria) through high performance in each learning outcome.

- To achieve a Distinction, a student will have satisfied all the Distinction criteria (and the Pass and Merit criteria), defining outstanding performance across the unit as a whole.

16.18 The award of a Pass is a defined level of performance and cannot be given solely on the basis of a student completing assignments. Students who do not satisfy the Pass criteria will be reported as Unclassified.

16.19 For Pearson qualifications, a single group grade will not be assigned; all assessment decisions will reflect individual attainment of learning outcomes.

16.20 Appeals and Recognition of Prior Learning (Pearson)

A Student Appeal is a request to review decisions made by the Assessor on progression, assessment and awards. Students may appeal assessment decisions following GBS policy and procedures.

16.21 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) considers whether students can demonstrate, through prior knowledge, understanding or skills, that they can meet the assessment requirements for a unit without developing them through a course of learning. It is used sparingly and is applicable to adult students returning to education. Refer to the GBS Recognition of Prior Learning Policy.

16.22 Registry, Late Submissions, Resubmissions and Repeat Units

The Registry team is responsible for correctly processing student registration and achievement claims using the Pearson Edexcel Online Platform in line with Pearson Regulations and the GBS Registration, Entry and Certification Policy.

16.23 For late submissions, resubmissions and repeat units, refer to the programme regulations for Pearson programmes and to sections 11.15 and 11.16 of this policy.

16.24 All documentation relating to Pearson assessment will be kept confidential and disclosed only to those persons who have a right to the information by virtue of their role, in line with the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018.

16.25 Monitoring, Review and Alternative Format

This policy may be amended by GBS at any time and will be reviewed annually. Any issues related to the monitoring and review of this policy should be directed to the ASQO Team at ASQO@globalbanking.ac.uk.

16.26 This policy can be provided in alternative formats (including large print, audio and electronic) upon request. For further information, or to make a request, please contact the ASQO Team at ASQO@globalbanking.ac.uk.

Definitions

Assessment: a coursework assignment or examination (practical or written) which evaluates student learning and performance against specific learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Assessments can be formative or summative.

Assessment brief: guidance provided for students on how to complete a specific item of assessment, to include information about the nature of the task, the format for presentation, and assessment criteria, and, if used, the marking scheme.

Assessment item: a piece of assessed work, e.g., an essay, project, assignment, or examination.

Assessment criteria: specific qualities of student work required to demonstrate successful achievement of the learning outcomes of the module and the programme. These may be generic in nature or may reflect the specific assessment item set.

Compensation: The formal awarding of a pass mark for a module where the module mark achieved is just below the pass mark, and where this can be considered appropriate through the application of the specified policy relevant to compensation, taking into account the student's performance in other modules.

Continuous Assessment: Assessing aspects of learners' knowledge or skills throughout their course and producing a final evaluation result from these assessments. Formative feedback should be embedded systematically within continuous assessment and given in a timely manner to support student development and improve student achievement.

Learning Outcomes: statements of what a student is expected to understand or to be able to do after completing the process of learning. Module learning outcomes reflect learning at the FHEQ level of the module. The programme learning outcomes should reflect the level of the qualification being awarded.

Module: A self-contained, formally structured unit of study, with a coherent and explicit set of learning outcomes and assessment criteria.

Formative activities: a set of structured activities designed specifically to help learners reflect on and measure their learning. Feedback is provided during or immediately following the activity. A formative activity may include a formative assessment.

Formative assessment: Assessment with a developmental purpose, designed to help learners learn more effectively by giving them feedback (but no numerical grade) on their performance and how it can be improved and/or maintained.

Summative assessment: Used to indicate the extent of a learner's success in meeting the assessment criteria and to award marks associated with academic credit. Typically, within summative assessment, the marks awarded count towards the final grade of the course/module/award.

Examination: a time-constrained assessment, normally presented to students for the first time at the beginning of the assessment. It is a formal test of a person's knowledge or proficiency in a subject or skill that may take different forms.

Final Assessment: a summative assessment conducted after teaching of the subject or course has finished and which contributes to the overall mark or grade. The final assessment does not necessarily need to be a time-constrained examination.

First Marking: the initial marking for assessments. The first marker(s) is/are normally the academic(s) who delivers or leads the delivery of the module.

Double Marking: the process by which student work is independently marked by two individuals, who are academics of GBS, with relevant subject knowledge and expertise.

Standardisation: the process of reviewing and confirming standards for first markers across different campuses at the start of the marking process to ensure that they are fair and consistent and confirming assessment marks.

Moderation: the process in which a senior member of academic staff reviews a selection of student work to affirm efficacy of the examining process, and verify that standards are consistent with that of other GBS campuses.

External Examiners: academics or other suitably qualified and experienced individuals with relevant subject expertise and contemporary knowledge of assessment practices and standards applicable to higher learning both in the UK and internationally. External examiners review proposed assessments and marking schemes and/or subject-specific rubrics, and a selection of completed and marked student work to assure the efficacy of assessments and the assessment processes. External Examiners must have no direct connection with GBS other than through their appointment as an External Examiner.