



MORLEY COLLEGE LONDON

Assessment Manual

POLICY OWNER:	<i>Head of Quality & Standards</i>
FINAL APPROVAL BY:	Policy Committee
Policy Category:	Corporate/Student
Approved by Policy Committee:	July 2021
Approved by Governing Body:	N/A
Review Date:	July 2025
<i>Last updated:</i>	<i>September 2022</i>

Contents

Assessment Policy:	3
Assessment Procedures	6
1. Access arrangements for examinations	6
2. College Exam Responsibilities	7
3. Academic Malpractice and Plagiarism	9
4. Internal Quality Assurance (Internal moderation and standardisation).....	12
5. Appeal of Grades.....	13
6. External Moderation (also known as <i>External Verification</i> or <i>External Examination</i>).....	14
7. Managing Invigilators	14
8. Certificates.....	15
9. Conflict of Interest	15
10. Procedure for checking:.....	15
11. Extenuating Circumstances	16
12. RPL/APEL	16
Appendix 1: Awarding and Validating Bodies of Qualifications at Morley College	
London.....	17
AAT	18
AQA.....	20
ASCENTIS - Access Provision	22
ASCENTIS – OFQUAL Qualifications (does not apply to Access provision).....	25
BCS.....	27
CITY AND GUILDS.....	29
CPCAB	31
KINGSTON UNIVERSITY.....	32
NCFE & CACHE.....	33
OCN LONDON - Access Provision.....	35
PEARSON – Higher National Certificates and Diplomas only.....	38
PEARSON BTEC – BTEC Nationals (level 3 and under).....	43
RAVENSBOURNE UNIVERSITY	46
UAL AO BODY	49
Template – for use for any new AO body	52
Appendix 2: Academic Malpractice Report Form	53
Appendix 3: Conflict of Interest Log (use one per AO Body).....	54
Appendix 4: Extenuating Circumstances for Access to Higher Education and Higher	
Education Courses	55
Appendix 4A: Extenuating Circumstances Request Form	58
Appendix 4B: Acceptable grounds and evidence when requesting extenuating	
circumstances	59
Appendix 4C: Example Extenuating Circumstances Log	62
Appendix 5: Recognising Prior Learning Applicant Tracker Form.....	63

1. Purpose and Scope of Policy:

One of the key strategic goals to realise our vision is to deliver an exceptional student experience by providing outstanding learning, teaching and assessment that meet diverse learning needs. This policy sets out our internal requirements and regulatory responsibilities around examinations and assessment which is a major component of the Student Journey.

The College offers a broad range of courses, both externally accredited and non-accredited. Each course will have assessment methods which have been developed by the College or stipulated by the Awarding Organisation (AO).

The Policy exists to provide guidance on:

- How the College will fulfil the requirements of the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) and other AO's in the form of an Examinations Policy.
- To act as a manual for staff involved in the delivery of College courses with respect to assessment and examinations.
- To provide a collated point of reference on the assessment procedures followed for the qualifications studied at the College. This does not replace detailed individual AO guidance, which can be accessed using the links provided within each section.

2. Equality and Diversity Analysis Screening:

In accordance with the College's Equality and Diversity Policy, the development of this policy complies with the Equality Act 2010 in ensuring due regard to eliminating discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations.

3. Applicability:

This policy is applicable to all staff involved in delivery of exams and assessment across the College and all students registered on accredited courses.

4. Definitions:

- **Assessment:** An assessment can be of a student's knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills. The College uses three types of assessment: initial or diagnostic, formative and summative.
- **Awarding Organisation (AO):** A body issuing qualifications (certificates, diplomas or titles) that formally recognises the learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and/or competencies) of an individual, following an assessment and validation procedure.
- **Examination:** A controlled test which determines the level of understanding/competency. The content of these are usually set by the AO's.
- **Initial or Diagnostic assessment:** Determines the preparedness of a student for achieving the learning outcomes of a course or module.
- **Formative assessment:** Measures a student's progress towards achieving the learning outcomes of a course or module.
- **Summative assessment:** Measures the degree to which a student has achieved the learning outcomes of a course or module.

5. Statutory and regulatory requirements:

All staff involved in examinations and assessment must ensure that they meet the requirements of any equality legislation.

The College will comply with the legislation, including making reasonable adjustments to the service that they provide to candidates in accordance with requirements defined by the legislation, AO's and JCQ.

Access arrangements: These are identified as early as possible by the tutor during induction; the student is referred to the Additional Learning Support team (ALS) who then meets the student and informs the subject teachers.

6. Policy Objectives:

- The document is designed to provide a foundation for staff and students when undertaking planning and quality assurance connected to assessment;
- Staff are responsible for reading the sections appropriate to them and staying up to date with AO guidance;
- The College will ensure systems and processes are in place to adequately assess learners' progress and achievement of learning outcomes;
- Where a course offers an externally accredited qualification, the College will ensure the requirements of the AO are satisfied;
- During exceptional circumstances additional information issued from Ofqual and other regulators may differ from what is contained within this document. The College will inform staff where possible of amends.

7. Policy Statement

Morley College London is a learning organisation that promotes the learning and the development of our staff and students alike. We believe in putting our students first in that we seek to ensure:

- Setting high expectations that encourage students to achieve and exceed their learning goal
- Providing an outstanding student experience
- Safeguarding the safety and welfare of our students
- Diversity being celebrated and equal opportunities actively promoted. The College operates as inclusive environment of which Fairness, Respect, Equality, Diversity, Inclusion and Engagement.
- Meeting the different abilities, aptitudes and interests of our students to provide
- Challenge and enable success which is demonstrated through assessment and exams

8. Implementation of Policy:

The policy will be implemented through the work of all staff that are involved in Learning, Teaching and Assessment delivery for accredited courses including both curriculum and professional services.

Staff should use this document to both refer to the College assessment regulations and also as a reference document which provides AO fundamentals. However staff are advised to always check their AO page for updates.

Please see procedures below for more information on implementation.

9. Communication and Training

The Policy will be communicated to staff during their induction with the Quality and Standards team with training delivered around pertinent issues arising throughout the academic year. It is available both on EMMA and the College website.

The document will be referred to within the both formal committees and centre working groups such as the Quality group at each centre. Staff involved with Learning, Teaching and Assessment delivery should be inducted to the document when they join the College by their Line Manager.

10. Monitoring and Reporting

The Assessment Policy will be reviewed every four years by the Quality and Standards team in liaison with members of MIS (Exams) and Student Services (ALS) The SLT is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Policy via reports from the Deputy Principal, Head of Quality and Standards and other Quality and Standards team members. There may be exceptional occasions where the policy needs to be reviewed outside of this cycle as led by the AO's and if so the Policy Committee will be informed.

11. Related References, Policies, Procedures, Forms and other Appendices:

[Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy](#)

[Student Support Policy](#)

[Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Statement of Intent](#)

[Departmental Service Standards](#)

[Complaints Policy](#)

[JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures](#)

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

1. Access arrangements for examinations

- 1.1 These are identified as early as possible by the tutor during induction; the student is referred to the Additional Learning Support (ALS) team who then meets the student and informs the subject teachers.
- 1.2 The College recognises that some students with learning difficulties/disabilities will need to use a laptop in exams as a reasonable adjustment in light of their disability. The overriding principle governing the use of laptops in exams is that this reflects the candidate's "normal way of working" i.e.: that they have been using a laptop in class and for exams throughout the year. The College recognises that students with the following difficulties may benefit from use of a laptop (this is not an exhaustive list):
 - A learning difficulty, which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to write legibly,
 - A medical condition,
 - A physical disability,
 - A sensory impairment,
 - Planning and organisational difficulties when writing by hand,
 - Very poor handwriting,
 - Other conditions which affect the student's ability to write at speed under timed restrictions
- 1.3 If a laptop is required, the Exams Team will inform IT Services, as agreed with ALS, via the Helpdesk, giving at least 3 working days' notice, including specific configurations required e.g.:
 - Spelling/grammar correction facility is disabled,
 - No internet access,
 - Software required i.e.: Microsoft Word,
 - Where candidate files should be stored
- 1.4 The ALS team will inform tutors of students with special education needs and any special arrangements that individual students will need during the course and in any assessments/exams. This will be communicated to the Exams Team.
- 1.5 The ALS team determines a student's access arrangement requirement. Ensuring there is appropriate evidence for a student's access arrangement is the responsibility of ALS. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence within the timescale requested.
- 1.6 Submitting completed access arrangement applications to the AO Bodies is the responsibility of the Exams Team.
- 1.7 The Exam and Room Booking Teams will arrange rooming for access arrangement candidates.
- 1.8 Invigilation and support for access arrangement students, as defined in the JCQ Access Arrangements Regulations, will be organised by the Exam Teams. The

Exams Office can only provide the service to the candidate when the ALS team (timeframe dependent on qualification) has formally requested it in advance.

2. College Exam Responsibilities

2.1 The **Principal**:

- As “Head of Centre” the Principal has overall responsibility for the College as an exams centre

2.2 The **Deputy Principal**:

- Advises on appeals and re-marks,
- Is responsible for reporting all suspected or actual incidents of malpractice - refer to the JCQ document *Suspected malpractice: Policies and Procedures*.

2.3 The **Centre Principals**:

- Have responsibility for oversight of Quality Assurance activities connected with assessment at their centres.
- May act as Head of Centre for the purposes of final sign off when only their centre runs qualifications with a particular AO.

2.4 The **Examinations (Exams) Team**:

- Manages the administration of external assessments and external exams,
- In collaboration with Centre Principals, Programme Managers/Subject Leaders, advises the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and all other relevant support staff on the annual exams timetable and procedures as proscribed by the various AO's, liaising with relevant teams to agree dates for on-demand examinations,
- Oversees the production and distribution, to all centre staff, of an annual calendar for all exams in which their candidates will be involved and communicates regularly with staff concerning imminent deadlines and events,
- Ensures candidates are informed of the exams timetable in coordination with the curriculum teams,
- Maintains systems and processes to support the timely entry of candidates for their exams,
- Receives, checks and stores securely all exam papers and completed scripts and ensures that scripts are dispatched as per the guidelines,
- Administers access arrangements and makes applications for special consideration following the regulations in the JCQ publication “*A guide to the special consideration process*”,
- Accounts for income and expenditure relating to all exam costs/charges,
- Organises the recruitment, training, and monitoring of a team of exams invigilators responsible for the conduct of external assessments and external exam
- Assists in the tracking, dispatching, and storage of returned coursework/controlled assessments,
- Cross-check final data from AO's with ILR data to ensure consistency,
- Arrange for the dissemination of exam results to candidates (for external assessments and external exams) or Curriculum Teams (for internal assessments and internal exams) as applicable,
- Arrange for the issuing of accredited certificates directly to students,

- In coordination with both Quality and Standards and Curriculum Teams, manage any post-results service requests.

2.5 The **Heads of School/Curriculum** and **Programme Managers/Subject Leaders**:

- Ensure candidates' coursework/controlled assessment marks are submitted, and any other material required by the appropriate AO's correctly and on schedule,
- Provide guidance and pastoral oversight of candidates who are unsure about exams entries or amendments to entries,
- Ensure accurate completion of entry by their teams, and where appropriate the entering of online mark sheets in adherence to deadlines as set by the Exams Teams,
- Accurate completion of coursework/controlled assessment declaration sheets,
- Follow cross-College post-results procedures, namely organising resits and progression to other courses,
- Work with ALS to ensure that necessary exam adjustments are identified,
- Inform the Exams Team of any changes concerning exams (e.g. changes of AO's, changes to specifications) after consulting with the Quality and standards team,
- Deal with any issues raised by the students concerned with exam entry.
- To note the responsibility sits with each of these roles at each centre when qualifications are ran across the centres

2.6 The **Tutors**:

- Supply information on entries, coursework and controlled assessments as required by the Programme Manager/Subject Leaders and/or Exam Team,
- Ensure that the necessary coursework and/or controlled assessments are completed on time and in accordance with JCQ guidelines or other relevant AO regulations,
- Assist in identifying candidates who may be eligible for access arrangements and sign-posting them to ALS,
- Ensure students fully understand the exam requirements as stated by the AO and the college
- Decide whether a candidate should be entered for a particular subject in consultation with the Programme Manager/Subject Leader where necessary,
- Mark and provide written, developmental feedback on internally assessed assignments ('coursework') within two working weeks of the date of submission.

2.7 The **Additional Learning Support Manager** (please see Service Standards):

- Identifies and test candidates' requirements for access arrangements and notifies the MIS Exams Office in good time so that they are able to put in place exam day arrangements.
- Submits applications for exam adjustment approval directly to AO's once a need has been identified.

- Works with the Exams Team to provide the access arrangements required (specialist equipment, etc.) by candidates in exam rooms on the day of the exam

2.8 The **Estates/Premises Team** (please see *Service Standards*):

- Ensure PCs are kept up to date with all necessary software required to run online Exams,
- Provide specialist IT equipment /software required as specified by ALS for specific individual needs.

2.9 The **Invigilators**:

- Assist the Exams Team in the efficient running of exams according to JCQ regulations and all other AO specific regulations outside of JCQ,
- Collect the exam papers and other material from the MIS Exams Office before the start of the exam,
- Collect all completed and unused exam papers in the correct order at the end of the exam and ensure their return to the MIS Exams Office

2.10 The **Candidates**:

- Understand coursework/controlled assessment regulations and sign declaration that authenticates the coursework as their own,
- Ensure they conduct themselves in all exams according to the JCQ or other relevant AO Organisation regulations,
- Agree to attend exam/s they are entered for (or agree to pay an administration fee for non-attendance), and
- Agree to complete internally assessed work (“coursework”) by the submission date, and to follow the correct procedures if deadlines are unable to be met.

3. Academic Malpractice and Plagiarism

3.1 The College, in accordance with the procedure set out below, will deal with academic malpractice. Academic malpractice includes unintentional acts, where students have not familiarised themselves with good academic practice. Students submitting work authenticate the submission is their own work via signing a cover sheet (hard copy or digital).

3.2 Academic malpractice may take a number of forms. The following is not an exhaustive list but includes:

- Plagiarism: this happens where students incorporate the work of others (published or unpublished) in their own work without properly acknowledging it, effectively claiming ownership for work that is not their own. This includes word-for-word borrowing as well as copying with minor changes. “Work” is not limited to text, but also includes statistics, assembled facts or arguments, figures, photographs, pictures or diagrams. Students must follow the correct referencing guidelines provided by the programme.
- Self-plagiarism, i.e. using the same work that a student submitted for a previous summative assessment.
- Using an essay-writing service, buying or otherwise obtaining work online or elsewhere, which a student then submits for an assessment. Commissioning an essay is fraud and the most severe penalty, termination

of the student's programme, may apply.

- Fraudulent or fabricated coursework, such as reports of practical work that are untrue and/or made up; fabrication of research or dishonest interpretation of data; unethical research practice.
- Cheating in exams e.g. through impersonation, taking in unauthorised materials or mobile phones, copying from other candidates or from notes.
- Collusion: submitting work produced jointly with another student (save where the terms of the assessment require collaboration).
- Deception, for example faking mitigating circumstances or forging a signature relating to a placement

3.3 Where there are incidents of alleged academic malpractice the tutor will report the suspicion to the relevant Programme Manager/Subject Leader setting out any evidence gathered in support of the allegation

3.4 The Programme Manager/Subject Leader will consider the allegation and:

- a) Where the Programme Manager/Subject Leader considers that malpractice has taken place they will determine a course of action based upon the severity of the alleged malpractice.
- b) Where the Programme Manager/Subject Leader concludes that malpractice has not taken place, no further action will be taken. A note of the allegation should be passed to the Quality and Standards Manager who will keep a record.
- c) If the student's behaviour could be considered a serious breach of the Disciplinary Code the Disciplinary Procedures should be invoked in conjunction with the Academic Malpractice Procedure below.

3.5 *Minor Malpractice*

3.5.1 Where the Programme Manager/Subject Leader considers that a minor breach of the regulations has taken place, they may exercise the discretion to address the matter through advice and support for the student.

3.5.2 The Programme Manager/Subject Leader will write to the student informing them of the allegation and the decision to address the matter through learning and teaching support. The Academic Malpractice Report Form, supporting evidence and any related correspondence should be forwarded to the Head of Quality and Standards

3.6 *Moderate and serious Malpractice*

3.6.1 Where the Programme Manager/Subject Leader considers that a moderate or serious breach of the regulations has taken place, they will send an initial warning letter to the student. The letter will explain that an allegation of academic malpractice has been made, and is under investigation, and will include a copy of the Academic Malpractice Procedures. The Head of Quality and Standards should be copied into the correspondence.

3.6.2 The investigation should include a discussion with the student. The student should be given at least 7 days' notice of the meeting and should be given the opportunity to attend on a mutually convenient date. If, once arrangements have been agreed, the student fails to attend on the agreed time and date, the College will provide one further opportunity for the student to attend. If the student fails to attend a second time, or if the student fails to respond to all

reasonable attempts to make arrangements, the investigation will continue without the initial meeting.

3.6.3 The Programme Manager/Subject Leader should write up a report of the meeting and submit it to the Chair of the Academic Malpractice Panel, together with any evidence. The Chair would normally be the Head of School/Curriculum for the area.

3.6.4 The Chair will consider the report and evidence and determine an appropriate course of action, based upon the severity of the allegation.

a) If the Chair considers that there is insufficient evidence for the case to go forward to the Academic Malpractice Panel, the student will be informed, in writing, that the case has been closed. The Quality and Standards team will keep the report, evidence and any correspondence in relation to the case as a record.

b) If the student admits to a moderate or serious breach of the regulations during the investigation phase, the Chair of the Academic Malpractice Panel will use their discretion to either:

i. Make a recommendation to the Exam Board on the severity of the malpractice and an appropriate penalty, without the need to convene a full panel. The Chair will inform the student using the standard template provided by the Head of Quality and Standards. The letter will include the Programme Manager/Subject Leader's written report and any supporting evidence; or

ii. Convene an Academic Malpractice Panel Hearing. The Chair will inform the student using the standard template provided by the Head of Quality and Standards, giving details of the arrangements for the Hearing. The letter will include full details of the allegation, including the Programme Manager/Subject Leader's written report and evidence, and a copy of the Academic Malpractice Procedures.

c) If the student contests an allegation of moderate or serious malpractice during the investigation phase, and there is sufficient evidence for the Academic Malpractice Panel to consider the case, the Chair will convene an Academic Malpractice Panel Hearing. The Chair will inform the student of the outcome, giving details of the arrangements for the Hearing. The letter will include full details of the allegation, including the Programme Manager/Subject Leader's written report and evidence, and a copy of the Academic Malpractice Procedures.

3.7 Academic Malpractice Panel Hearing

3.7.1 For contested moderate or serious cases of malpractice, or for more complex cases of admitted serious malpractice, the Chair will convene an Academic Malpractice Panel.

3.7.2 The panel should consist of Head of School as Chair, Head of Quality and Standards and Head of Student Services. Additional members of staff may be consulted as appropriate.

3.7.3 The student will be given at least 14 days' notice of the hearing and should be given the opportunity to attend on a mutually convenient date. If, once arrangements have been agreed, the student fails to attend on the agreed time and date, the College will provide one further opportunity for the student to attend. If the student fails to attend a second time, or if the student fails to

respond to all reasonable attempts to make arrangements, the hearing will take place in the absence of the student concerned.

3.7.4 The outcome of the hearing will be communicated to the student by letter within 5 working days. The student is permitted to be accompanied by a nominated person at the meeting, barring a legal representative.

3.8 There is no right to appeal the Academic Malpractice Panel's decision.

3.9 The Head of Quality and Standards will report Academic Misconduct to the AO when the matter is deemed to require this due to the level of seriousness. This may include contacting the AO to seek their advice on outcomes.

4. Internal Quality Assurance (Internal moderation and standardisation)

4.1 In order to ensure that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the relevant AO, The College is committed to a quality assurance process of internal moderation and standardisation to ensure consistency of marking. Further information can be found within the College's Internal Quality Assurance Policy (draft).

Internal Moderation

4.2 The process of internal moderation includes all staff in the delivery of a qualification and should be completed in line with the necessary AO regulations. Internal moderation process cover assignments, student work and grading decisions. Internal Verifiers should be appointed within Subject/Programme areas in line with quality assurance guidance from the AO and reported to the Quality and Standards Team. Course and qualification guidebooks should be downloaded from AO websites and internal moderation procedures followed from this. The Quality and Standards Team may assist in finding this information and advising on how internal moderation takes places, but it is the responsibility of the Internal Verifiers within curriculum teams to understand and complete this process.

4.3 Where it is not stipulated by AO guidance a 10% sample should be moderated from a cohort including work on grade boundaries.

Standardisation

4.4 Standardisation activities should be completed within delivery teams annually and can include:

- meeting with Quality and Standards team for pre-arranged training
- discussing qualification requirements to ensure equal understanding
- preparing materials for induction and/or initial assessment
- discussing how to deliver consistently across multiple tutors on same qual.
- working through standardisation materials and activities from AOs
- discussing decisions made by other assessors
- comparing how documents and records have been completed and stored
- peer observation and feedback

4.5 Dated records need to be kept of all standardisation activities for evidence in external verification with AO's. Some AO's stipulate specific requirements for standardisation, so Subject Leaders/Programme Managers need to check this ahead of each academic year in course handbooks and with Quality Enhancement Managers (QEMs).

5. Appeal of Grades

- 5.1 There is no appeal process for the grades assigned to non-accredited learners.
- 5.2 Where the internal assessment of student work contributes to the achievement of a qualification or award, the student will have the right to appeal the grade assigned, if they believe that the quality assurance process may not have been followed in relation to their work.
- 5.3 A grade appeal may be submitted on two grounds:
 - a) In the AO of the grade, the College failed to follow the procedures set out in its Assessment Strategy, led by the AO guidance;
 - b) There is evidence of bias or prejudice on the part of the assessor.

5.4 Appeals Procedure

- 5.4.1 The appeal must be submitted in writing to the Deputy Principal within seven calendar days of the student's receipt of the moderated grade. If the grade has been posted to the student, he or she will be regarded as being in receipt two days after posting. The appeal must set out the grounds for challenging the grade assigned.
- 5.4.2 The Deputy Principal will appoint a senior manager to conduct the investigation. This manager will not have been involved in the internal assessment process for that subject. The purpose of the investigation will be to decide whether the process used for internal assessment conformed to the AO specification and subject-specific associated documents.
- 5.4.3 The Deputy Principal will respond to the appellant within 14 days of receipt of the appeal request, stating their decision to allow the appeal to go forward to an Appeals Hearing or disallowing it.
- 5.4.4 The Deputy Principal will chair the Appeals Hearing or they may delegate to another SLT member or the Head of Quality and Standards. Also present will be a Programme Manager/Subject Leader (not from the connected programme area). The member(s) of academic staff responsible for the assigning of the grade and the appellant will also attend. Others may be invited solely for the purposes of giving evidence either by the chair or by the appellant.
- 5.4.5 The Appeals Hearing will consider the following:
 - a) The written appeal,
 - b) The justification of the grade as provided by the assessor/ moderator,
 - c) The investigating officer's report,
 - d) The evidence of witnesses (if called),
 - e) Any other material the chair considers relevant.

Written documentation to be considered at the hearing will be provided to the appellant at least 48 hours prior to the hearing. If either the chair or the appellant wishes to call witnesses they must notify the other party at least 48 hours prior to the hearing.

- 5.4.6 The Appeals Hearing will either:
 - a) reject the appeal, or
 - b) require that a different member, or members, of the academic staff who

would have been, in the decision of the Chair, appropriately qualified to have carried out the original assessment, reassess the assignment. If the 2 markers cannot agree, the opinion of a third marker will be sought. This is not a stipulation that the assignment be given a different grade.

The reassessment will be final, save only if provision is made for further appeal in the rules and regulations of the AO.

- 5.4.7 The appellant will be informed in writing within 7 calendar days of the outcome of the appeal, including any relevant correspondence with the AO, and any changes made to internal assessment procedures.
- 5.4.8 The outcome of the appeal will be logged as a formal complaint and a written record will be kept and made available to the AO upon request. Should the appeal bring any irregularity in internal procedures to light, the AO will be informed.

6. External Moderation (also known as *External Verification* or *External Examination*)

- 6.1 After candidates' work has been internally assessed/moderated, it may be externally moderated by the AO through their appointed External Moderator/External Verifier/External Examiner to ensure consistency in marking between all centres offering that qualification. The moderation process may lead to grades going up or down. This process is outside the control of the College and is not covered by this procedure.
- 6.2 Where assessment is carried out externally a student's right of appeal will be governed by the rules and regulations of the AO Body (please see [Appendix 1](#)). However, a student seeking to appeal a grade externally assigned should normally seek the support of the College by writing to the Deputy Principal setting out the grounds of their appeal.
- 6.3 The grounds on which the College would normally be expected to support an appeal are:
 - a) The appellant failed the assignment when expected to pass,
 - b) The appellant gained a significantly poorer grade than expected,
 - c) The College is aware of circumstances – for instance, the maladministration of an exam – which may have, through no fault of the appellant's, significantly impacted the appellant's ability to evidence their relevant knowledge, understanding, skills or abilities and has not already been accounted for through special consideration requests to the AO,
 - d) The appellant has written confirmation of support from the relevant Programme Manager/Subject Leader.
- 6.4 When supporting a student's appeal to an AO, the College may require a deposit from the student, which is refundable, should the appeal result in a successful re-grading.
- 6.5 Please note that contacting staff not directly involved in the process to support an appeal is not acceptable and may result in rejection of the appeal.

7. Managing Invigilators

- 7.1 Only invigilators vetted by the Examinations team may invigilate exams.

- 7.2 Invigilators are recruited, timetabled, trained and briefed by the Exams Team.
- 7.3 Securing the necessary Disclosure Barring Service (DBS) clearance for new invigilators is the responsibility of the People Operations team.
- 7.4 The centre's published rules on acceptable dress and behaviour apply at all times. Candidates' personal belongings remain their own responsibility and the centre accepts no liability for their loss or damage.
- 7.5 In an exam room, candidates must not have access to items other than those clearly allowed in the instructions on the question paper, the stationery list, or the specification for that subject. This is particularly true of mobile phones and other electronic communication or storage devices with text or digital facilities. Any precluded items must not be taken into an exam room.
- 7.6 Disruptive candidates are dealt with in accordance with JCQ guidelines. Candidates are expected to stay for the full exam time at the discretion of the Invigilator.
- 7.7 An appropriate member of staff must accompany candidates who leave an exam room at all times.
- 7.8 The Exams Team is responsible for handling late candidates on exam day. Absent candidates are dealt with by the Programme Managers/Subject Leaders in conjunction with the course tutor.

8. Certificates

- 8.1 Candidates will receive their certificates:
 - Via an eCertificate where relevant or;
 - By post (recorded delivery) or;
 - Collected and signed for (on request and by appointment only).
- 8.2 Certificates can be collected on behalf of a candidate by third parties, provided they have written authority from the candidate to do so, and bring suitable identification with them that confirms who they are. The MIS Exams Office must agree this beforehand.
- 8.3 The centre retains certificates for one year. After this time, they are disposed of according to the individual board's guidelines. The student must contact the AO Body for any replacement certificate.
- 8.4 The cost of replacement certificates are the responsibility of the candidate except where the fault lies with the College.

9. Conflict of Interest

- 9.1 A conflict of interest occurs where the professional responsibilities and position of trust held by an individual or an organisation is compromised by the potential for personal gain or organisational benefit from a situation. E.g. If a member of staff is related to a student whose work they assess, there is a conflict of interest as they have a personal interest in their relative's achievement

10. Procedure for checking:

- 10.1 Any conflicts of interest should be checked at the start of the delivery and confirmed with the relevant QEM. The QEMs will check this as part of the first round quality

checkpoints.

- 10.2 The relevant QEM will update the AO Body Conflict of Interest Log (see [Appendix 3](#)), including if there are no reported conflicts
- 10.3 The Head of Quality and Standards will confirm with the Head of MIS at the start of each new academic year if there are any conflicts from within the Exams Office.
- 10.4 Activities related to managing a conflict of interest:
 - Staff are trained in managing boundaries and related conflicts as part of their induction.
 - Where there is potential for a conflict of interest, the AO body will be notified, and their agreement requested prior to the start of the course.
 - Development is provided for staff and students on key policies during their induction and new policies or procedures are introduced in Tutorials. The importance of disclosure should be discussed in these meetings.
 - If a conflict of interest is identified that has not been disclosed the related examination or assessment will be invalidated and the staff disciplinary procedure will be activated. The qualification AO body and the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) will be notified of the conflict of interest.
 - When a conflict has been disclosed the College will take steps to manage the conflict e.g. provide an alternative assessor, internal verifier, invigilator or support worker who is not related to any student, inform the AO body if the teacher is the only available specialist in that subject area to seek their permission and to arrange for any additional scrutiny to monitor fair and impartial approaches, provide details of conflicts of interest to visiting External Quality Assurers and External Examiners or others associated with the AO body for the relevant qualification.
- 10.5 If a student or staff member believes that a declaration of conflict of interest has not been managed correctly they may raise a complaint in line with the [College Complaint's Policy](#).

11. Extenuating Circumstances

- 11.1 An Extenuating Circumstance is a major change in circumstances or an acute worsening of a pre-existing condition which you had at the time of your enrolment.
- 11.2 If students on HE and Access to HE programmes feel unable to meet a deadline due to extenuating circumstances, they may request an extension from the relevant Programme Manager/Subject Leader. Students should refer to [Appendix 4 for detailed information](#) and [Extenuating Circumstances Request Form](#).

12. RPL/APEL

- 12.1 A separate [RPL/APEL policy](#) exists for Higher Education entry points.
- 12.2 For all other levels of study the College will assess potential incoming applicants on a case by case basis directed by the relevant AO and Validating Organisation's guidance and support.
- 12.3 The *Recognising Prior Learning Applicant Tracker* form at [Appendix 5](#) should be used for all students applying for mid-programme entry.

Appendix 1: Awarding and Validating Bodies of Qualifications at Morley College London

Awarding Organisation (AO) or Validating Body name	Page no.
AAT	18
AQA	20
Ascentis – Access Provision	22
Ascentis – OFQUAL Provision	25
BCS	27
City and Guilds	29
CPCAB	31
Kingston University	32
NCFE	33
OCN London	35
Pearson Higher Nationals Level 4 and 5	38
Persons Entry levels and Levels 1 to Level 3	43
Ravensbourne	46
UAL	49
Template – for use for any new AO body	52

AAT

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for Association of Accounting Technicians.

AO body website: <https://www.aat.org.uk/>

AO body email address: centre.support@aat.org.uk

Link to key staff documents/handbooks: n/a

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the Programme Manager/Subject Leader for Business, Enterprise and Professional Training and the Head of Curriculum for Business and IT.

Internal Moderation

n/a

Extenuating circumstances

If students experience extenuating circumstances, which prevent them from sitting an external examination on the day, they should speak to the Programme Manager responsible for qualification delivery in the first instance.

Re-assessment/Resubmission

AAT's enquiries and appeals procedure can be used if there is a reason to believe that the result and/or percentage score for an assessment, or the overall grade and/or percentage score for a graded qualification is incorrect or there is disagreement with decisions made regarding reasonable adjustments or special considerations for an assessment taken (where an application has been made to AAT)

Students and staff can also use the enquiries and appeals procedure to make an appeal against a Malpractice Review Panel (MRP) decision, regarding actions to be taken against them following an investigation into malpractice or maladministration.

There are two stages to AAT's enquiries and appeals procedure: Stage 1 (review) and Stage 2 (appeal). A Stage 1 review must be completed before a Stage 2 appeal can be requested, except in the case of an appeal against a MRP decision.

The current fees (as of August 2022) for each stage of the procedure are as follows.

Stage 1: Basic Review: £17 per student, per assessment

Stage 1: Full Review: £37 per student, per assessment

Stage 2: Individual Appeal (for Stage 1 or MRP decision): £127 per student, per assessment

Further information can be found:

<https://www.aat.org.uk/assessment/enquiries-and-appeals>

Grading

The possible grading outputs for this qualification are: Competent or Not Yet Competent.

Results

Results for computer-marked assessments will be available within 24 hours through the AAT website

Results for synoptic assessments will be made available within six weeks of the last day of the synoptic window

Final results will be confirmed through the MIS Exams Office, following course completion.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above.

Fees

The registration and examination fees for this course are included.

AQA

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved AQA centre.

AO body website:

<https://www.aqa.org.uk/subjects/english/gcse/english-language-8700>

AO body email address: english-gcse@aqa.org.uk

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

<https://filestore.aqa.org.uk/resources/english/specifications/AQA-8700-SP-2015.PDF>

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the Programme Manager/Subject Leader for English. The Programme Manager/Subject Leader needs to ensure that the Head of Centre Declaration is submitted with the

Internal Moderation

The non-exam assessment is marked internally and externally moderated. The Programme Manager/ Subject Leader will carry out internal standardisation according to the process described in the AQA specification, and confirm this on a centre declaration sheet. The Programme Manager/Subject Leader needs to ensure that the Head of Centre Declaration is signed by the Principal and submitted alongside the grades for the non-exam assessment. Internal standardisation may involve all teachers moderating some sample work, and identifying differences in marking standards.

Extenuating circumstances

Special consideration can be applied when:

- A) A student is fully prepared for the exam but is disadvantaged due to illness or unavoidable circumstances beyond their control at the time of the exam or when they complete their coursework/controlled assessment.
 - In these cases, a small percentage is added to the raw mark. The percentage is determined by using the guidelines agreed by all the AO bodies and published by the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ).
- B) A student is absent from an examination for a valid reason.
 - In these cases, a mark is calculated for the missing unit provided the student has completed enough of the specification to meet the minimum requirements specified by JCQ. The calculation of the missing mark takes into account the student's performance in the other comparable units of the exam and the national average for those units. This method is considered to be fair and consistent.

The MIS Exams Officer at College must apply online using the Special Consideration section of e-AQA and can select one of the following four options:

- Disadvantaged candidate – for a student who was disadvantaged at the time of a written exam.
- Absent candidate – for a student who was absent from a written exam.
- Group request – for a group of students for any exam or assessment.
- Non-timetabled assessment – for a student whose coursework, oral or practical assessment has been lost or is incomplete.

AQA's Special Consideration Team then processes applications and the Exams Team can select 'view requests' to see the outcomes.

Re-assessment/Resubmission

Candidates can pay to submit a formal enquiry about results or to have their exam re-marked. The deadline for this is the September following the June exam. The marks can go up or down and the turnaround period is 20 days.

Grading

The possible grading outputs for this qualification are: The grading is from 1-9. 9, 8 and 7 correspond to the current old grades of A* and A. A grade 6 is a little higher than the old B grade. A 'standard pass' is a grade 4, and a 'strong pass' is a grade 5.

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above. Results are posted directly to the candidates.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with [College policy](#).

Fees

The registration and examination fees for this course are included.

ASCENTIS - Access Provision

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for **Ascentis**.

AO body website: www.ascentis.co.uk

AO body email address: operations@ascentis.co.uk (use this address if you have exhausted the provider's complaints/appeals procedure)

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

Key staff documents are held within the Ascentis portal. Please speak to your Subject Lead for Access or the Quality Enhancement Manager for Access to HE and HE.

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with:

- Level 3 Access Science Pathways at North Kensington Centre: the Subject Leader for Science and Health and their associated Head of Curriculum for Health, Education and Science
- Level 3 Access Humanities Pathways at North Kensington Centre: the Head of Arts and Humanities

Internal Moderation

Each Ascentis Access to HE Diploma must appoint a suitable Internal Moderator for each subject area.

A sample plan will be created by the subject internal moderator at the start of the year covering each learner, tutor, and groups. It is not necessary to sample the work of all learners over the Diploma. Internal moderation sampling should be completed prior to external moderation so that any overlap in sample is coincidental.

There is no regulatory requirement in terms of the sample size for internal moderation but the College must demonstrate – through the lead subject internal moderator – that the sample is representative. In selecting the sample, consider: mode of delivery (blended/in-class), tutor experience (a new tutor should have more assessed work sampled); the number of tutors; any disruptions to course delivery (e.g. a new tutor being used).

The moderator should (this list picks up the main themes, there are additional areas, please refer to the Access to HE Centre Handbook): ensure tutor feedback is clear; presentation issues such as grammar and spelling are picked up by the assessor; identify if any issues need to be resolved; check that the documentation is fully completed, dated and signed.

Extenuating circumstances

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above and application form in [appendix 4A](#). If work is submitted after the formal deadline has passed, and no extension has been granted (and there are no exceptional extenuating circumstances which explain the failure to request an extension), all grade indicators relating to that assignment must be capped at pass.

If an assignment is submitted after the deadline without an extension having been granted and the work does not meet the learning outcomes, there is no opportunity for resubmission except via the referrals process (see below).

Re-assessment/Resubmission

If a submission is not successful at the first attempt (that is, one or more of the learning outcomes for the assignment has not been achieved), the assignment is regarded as an unsuccessful submission. When a submission is unsuccessful, no credit can be awarded, it is not eligible for grading, and the grading process should not be applied. In these

circumstances, the student should be offered the possibility of resubmission. There is only one opportunity for resubmission.

Resubmissions:

- the original submission must be returned to the student, with written feedback which explains which learning outcome(s) has/have not been achieved
- no feedback about the standard of the work in relation to grades may be given at this stage
- the specific requirements of a resubmission opportunity must be made clear to the student
- successful resubmissions must be graded following the same process as used for successful submissions and grades are given accordingly – only one resubmission opportunity may be provided for any individual assignment (unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted).

If the resubmission is unsuccessful (that is, the resubmitted work still does not meet the learning outcome(s) in full), the only means by which a further opportunity for resubmission can be provided within the same registration period is through referral.

Referrals

Normally, a student is permitted only one opportunity to resubmit work which fails to meet all requirements of the associated learning outcomes. The referral process allows the course team to recommend that a student should be permitted a second resubmission opportunity. Referral may also be requested for students who have submitted work after a deadline without an agreed extension, and this work has failed to meet the requirements of one or more of the associated learning outcomes. If this occurs within the duration of a course, the recommendation is referred to the lead/external moderator through the College's Access Co-Ordinator.

If the need for referral occurs at the end of the course (for example, as the consequence of assessments that have been taken in the last weeks of a course), the recommendation is taken to the awards board, as referrals at this stage in a course have implications for staffing, resources and results that need to be fully considered and carefully managed.

Grading

The possible grading outputs for this qualification are: Pass, Merit or Distinction. The qualification is comprised of 60 credits: 45 graded credits at level 3, and 15 ungraded credits of study skills. Grades are confirmed at the final assessment board.

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above. E-certificates and transcripts will be provided by the AO Body and distributed by the Exams Office at College.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

The Centre/learner has 20 working days from the date that the unit grade is confirmed, this will be the date of either the internal moderation or external moderation depending on the arrangements made between the Centre and Ascentis. Learners should retain all their assessment evidence until they receive their results as this will be needed should they wish to lodge an appeal.

Learners should log an appeal with the College first, if they have exhausted the College's appeals process, they can appeal to Ascentis using the contact form at the top of this information section about Ascentis. The learner must be able to provide evidence that they have appealed through the College first before contacting Ascentis.

If a learner lodges an appeal which the College agrees with, the College will then contact

Ascentis to progress the appeal. Further details are available on the Ascentis website.

Ascentis charge a fee of £50 to cover the administrative and personnel costs involved in the dealing with appeals. This will be refunded should the appeal be successful.

Fees

The registration fees for this course are included.

ASCENTIS – OFQUAL Qualifications (does not apply to Access provision)

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for **Ascentis**.

AO body website: www.ascentis.co.uk

AO body email address: operations@ascentis.co.uk

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

Available on the Ascentis website, users must register a request through Ascentis (or speak to the Quality Enhancement Manager: Access to HE and HE).

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with:

- Level 2 Health and Social Care Pre-Access at North Kensington Centre: the Subject Leader for Science and Health and their associated Head of Curriculum for Health, Education and Science

Internal Moderation

An Internal Quality Assurer (IQA) will select a sample to cover: assessment decisions made by each assessor; each assessment method; learner work across all levels and units; learner work which reflects unit claims; and each assessment site. Where there are 10 learners, all portfolios are to be sampled.

Total Entries	Total Sample (Per portfolio or part of)
Up to 10 portfolios	All portfolios should be sampled
11 – 20	50%, based on the criteria listed above
Above 20	25%, based on the criteria listed above
Unitised sample	All units submitted to be sampled for each assessor

The IQA will increase the sample to reflect: new assessors; where a new specification has been introduced/new units assessed; work where there are concerns when the assessment decisions do not meet the requirements of the qualification.

Standardisation of the assessment decisions made by all the assessors should be carried out by the IQA in a standardisation meeting which must be documented.

Extenuating circumstances

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above.

Where a qualification is assessed through the completion of a portfolio of evidence, and the learner fails to complete the portfolio due to adverse circumstances, it is expected that the learner completes the portfolio requirements at a later date, as long as the learner's registration is still current.

Re-assessment/Resubmission

The Pre-Access courses use both formative and summative assessments, allowing the students to meet the Assessment Criteria at different times. A number of different assessment methods are available (e.g. oral questions, discussion recording, witness statements etc.) making it possible for other methods to be used to fill the gaps to meet the Assessment Criteria. Students can submit formative work for the tutor to check before the

summative work is handed in, so guidance is always given at each stage of learning. With all of these enabling methods in place, it is unlikely that students will require re-submissions. Should a resubmission be deemed necessary, the College will determine re-assessment and resubmission requirements. Should this be required, please contact the Quality Enhancement Manager: Access to HE and HE to discuss.

Grading

The possible grading outputs for this qualification are: achieved/not achieved. To be successful:

- To achieve the Level 2 Certificate in Health and Social Care Professions learners must achieve a minimum of 13 credits, with a minimum of 4 credits from the Personal and Social Development optional units and a minimum of 9 credits from the Health and Social Care optional units. At least 7 credits must be at Level 2.
- To achieve the Level 2 Extended Certificate in Health and Social Care Professions learners must achieve a minimum of 25 credits, with a minimum of 7 credits from the Personal and Social Development optional units and a minimum of 18 credits from the Health and Social Care optional units. At least 13 credits must be at Level 2.
- To achieve the Level 2 Diploma in Health and Social Care Professions learners must achieve a minimum of 37 credits, with a minimum of 10 credits from the Personal and Social Development optional units and a minimum of 27 credits from the Health and Social Care optional units. At least 19 credits must be at Level 2.

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with [College policy](#). If an individual learner wishes to appeal against a decision taken by their Centre they must first of all go through the Centre's appeals process before bringing the matter to Ascentis.

Learners should retain all their assessment evidence until they receive their results as this will be needed should they wish to lodge an appeal.

Learners should log an appeal with the College first, if they have exhausted the College's appeals process, they can appeal to Ascentis using the contact form at the top of this information section about Ascentis. The learner must be able to provide evidence that they have appealed through the College first before contacting Ascentis.

If a learner lodges an appeal which the College agrees with, the College will then contact Ascentis to progress the appeal. Further details are available on the Ascentis website.

Ascentis charge a fee of £50 to cover the administrative and personnel costs involved in the dealing with appeals. This will be refunded should the appeal be successful.

Fees

The registration and fees for this course are included.

BCS

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for BCS.

AO body website: <http://www.bcs.org/category/14405>

AO body email address: bcslondon@bcs.uk

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

<https://www.bcs.org/media/1629/itq-suite-specification.pdf>

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the Programme Manager/Subject Leader for Business, Enterprise and Professional Training and the Head of Curriculum for Business and IT.

Internal Moderation

n/a

Extenuating circumstances

A special consideration request can be made post examination to adjust the mark or grade to reflect temporary injury, illness or an event outside of your control (such as a family emergency or bereavement), that occurred just before, or at the time of the examination/assessment. A special consideration can also be requested if the reasonable adjustments agreed in advance of the examination / assessment, proved inadequate. In most circumstances, BCS would expect the centre delay the examination in the event of a temporary illness or bereavement.

Re-assessment/Resubmission

Re-sits are offered at the end of each course.

In the first instance, a student must appeal their result with the Programme Manager/Head of Curriculum who will conduct an investigation and communicate the outcome of this to the student.

In the event that students are still not satisfied, then they can raise the appeal with BCS. Students will be required to provide written evidence of the appeal they have submitted to the Programme Manager/Head of Curriculum.

When submitting an appeal to BCS, students must provide relevant supporting information:

- Name and BCS registration number.
- Date(s) you received notification of a BCS result.
- Title and number of the BCS qualification affected or nature of service affected (if appropriate).
- Full nature of the appeal.
- Contents and outcome of any communications relating to the investigation carried out by the College.

The appeal is considered by the Head of Quality and Standards who will decide if there is a case for appeal.

The standard appeal fee is £100.00 + VAT.

Grading

Pass or Fail

Results

All tests are computer marked and results issued on the same day.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above.

Fees

The registration and examination fees for this course are included.

CITY AND GUILDS

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved center for City and Guilds.

AO body website: <https://www.cityandguilds.com/>

AO body email address: general.enquiries@cityandguilds.com

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

[ESOL](#)

[Functional Skills English and Maths](#)

[Functional Skills ICT](#)

[Education and Training Level 3](#)

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the:

Qualification	Subject Lead / Programme Manager	Head of Curriculum / School	Centre
ESOL	Subject Lead ESOL/ Programme Manager ESOL	Head of Essential Skills	Waterloo, Chelsea, North Kensington
Functional Skills English, Maths, ICT	Project Manager Lambeth	Head of Community and Foundation Learning	Waterloo (Community Centre)
Education and Training Level 3	Programme Manager – Business Enterprise	Head of School – Humanities & Applied Sciences	Waterloo

Internal Moderation

Levels 1 and 2 ESOL: The speaking and listening and Writing assessment is internally marked and moderated. A sample of assessments are internally moderated by the lead IV and externally moderated by a City and Guilds External Verifier.

Entry 1-3 ESOL, Functional Skills, E&T and Medical Administration: Components are internally marked and moderated. A sample of assessments are internally moderated by the lead IV and externally moderated by a City and Guilds External Verifier.

Extenuating circumstances

Special consideration may be given following a dated examination for candidates who are present for the examination or assessment but may have been disadvantaged, for example, by temporary illness or adverse circumstances during the examination. Students should speak to the Programme Manager responsible for qualification delivery in the first instance.

Re-assessment/Resubmission

Re-assessment is at the College's discretion, but students may be allowed one further resit depending on the grades achieved.

Grading

Pass or Fail

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above.

Fees

The registration and examination fees for these courses are included.

CPCAB

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for the Counselling and Psychotherapy Central AO Body.

AO body website: <https://www.cpcab.co.uk/>

AO body email address: contact@cpcab.co.uk

Link to key staff documents/handbooks: <https://www.cpcab.co.uk/qualifications/>

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the Programme Manager/Subject Leader for Health and Social Care at Waterloo and the Head of Curriculum for Arts and Humanities at North Kensington.

Internal Moderation

Completed units are internally and externally moderated.

Extenuating circumstances

If students experience extenuating circumstances, which prevent them from submitting course work or assignments by the deadline, they may be able to apply for an extension. For Level 1-2 courses, students should speak to the Programme Manager responsible for course delivery in the first instance. For Level 3 courses, students should refer to the Extenuating Circumstances Request Form in the Advanced Learning Tutor handbook, available on EMMA.

Re-assessment/Resubmission

If the external assessment result is 'not proficient', the centre can arrange with CPCAB for to re-sit the assessment or appeal the assessment result. A fee is charged for both a re-sit and an appeal. If the appeal is successful, the fee is refunded. The tutor can ask CPCAB for verbal feedback on external assessment results in order to help the centre decide whether an appeal is warranted.

Grading

Proficient or not proficient

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above.

Fees

The registration and examination fees for this course are included. Fees for appeals and re-sits <https://www.cpcab.co.uk/centres/fees>

KINGSTON UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Morley College London is a collaborative centre for Kingston University for the delivery of the Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree in Early Years only.

AO body website: www.kingston.ac.uk

AO body email address: Education@kingston.ac.uk

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

The College course team have access to the consortium resources via Kingston's portal 'Box'. Please speak to the Quality Enhancement Manager: Access to HE and HE if you have a query.

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the Course Lead, supported by the Head of Curriculum for Health, Education and Science.

Recognition of Prior Learning/Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning

Please email education@kingston.ac.uk.

Internal Moderation

Please see [Liaison Document](#)

Extenuating circumstances

[Mitigating Circumstances and Extensions Regulations](#)

Re-assessment/Resubmission:

Please see Section 5 of the [Undergraduate Regulations](#)

Grading

[University Grade Descriptors](#)

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body in accordance with [Academic Regulations 1: Awards of the University](#).

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

[Academic Regulations 8: Academic Appeals](#)

Fees

The registration and examination fees for this course are included:

<https://www.kingston.ac.uk/undergraduate/courses/early-years-foundation/>

NCFE & CACHE

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for NCFE.

AO body website: <https://www.ncfe.org.uk/>

AO body email address: customersupport@ncfe.org.uk

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

[Award in Preparing to Work in Schools](#)

[Certificate in Supporting Teaching and Learning in Schools \(L2\)](#)

[Award in Mentoring \(L1\)](#)

[Award in Working with Children \(L1\)](#)

[Certificate in Assessing Vocational Achievement \(L3\)](#)

[Award in Introduction to Health, Social Care and Children's and Young People's Settings \(L1\)](#)

[Certificate in Introduction to Health, Social Care and Children's and Young People's Settings \(L1\)](#)

[Award in Occupational Studies for the Workplace \(L1\)](#)

[Award in Occupational Studies for the Workplace \(Entry 3\)](#)

[Diploma for the Early Years Workforce \(Early Years Educator\) \(Level 3\)](#)

[Certificate in Photography \(L2\)](#)

[Certificate in Awareness of Mental Health Problems \(L2\)](#)

[Award in Employability Skills \(L1\)](#)

[Extended Certificate in Understanding Stewarding at Spectator Events \(L2\)](#)

[Certificate in Principles of Business Administration \(VRQ\) \(L2\)](#)

[Technical Certificate in Health and Social Care \(L3\)](#)

[Certificate in Customer Service for Health and Social Care Settings \(L2\)](#)

[Award in Awareness of Substance Misuse \(L1\)](#)

[Certificate in Supporting Teaching and Learning \(L3\)](#)

[Diploma in Care \(L2\)](#)

[Diploma in Adult Care \(L3\)](#)

[Diploma for the Early Years Practitioner \(L2\)](#)

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the Programme Manager/Subject Leader for:

Qualification	Subject Lead / Programme Manager	Head of Curriculum / School	Centre
Health, Education and Childcare	Programme Manager – H&SoC Quality & Curriculum Manager – Community Learning Lambeth	Heads of School/ Head of Curriculum	Waterloo & CL, North Kensington
Occupational Studies	Programme Manager – Business Quality & Curriculum Manager – Community Learning Lambeth	Heads of School/ Head of Curriculum	Waterloo & CL, North Kensington
Business	Programme Manager – Business	Head of School	Waterloo
The Arts	Subject Leader – Photography	Head of Curriculum	Chelsea

Internal Moderation

In line with College procedures, see [section](#) above.

Extenuating circumstances

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above.

Re-assessment/Resubmission

N/A

Grading

Pass, Merit, Distinction

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above.

Fees

The registration and examination fees for this course are included.

OCN LONDON - Access Provision

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for OCN London.

AO body website: www.ocnlondon.org.uk

AO body email address: please complete the web enquiry form on the website
www.ocnlondon.org.uk/Contact-us

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

Staff can access documents from the Access to HE Centre Area
www.ocnlondon.org.uk/Choose-login There is one institutional log in, please contact the Quality Enhancement Manager for Access to HE and HE should you require access.

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the Programme Manager/Subject Leads and their respective Head for each Diploma.

Qualification	Subject Lead / Programme Manager	Head of Curriculum / School	Centre
Access to HE Diploma: Business Studies	Programme Manager: Business, Enterprise and Vocational Training	Head of School: Humanities and Applied Sciences	Waterloo
Access to HE Diploma: Fashion Studies	Programme Manager: Fashion	Head of School: Visual and Digital Arts	Waterloo
Access to HE Diploma: Creative Digital Media	Programme Manager: Digital, Film, Photography and Media	Head of School: Visual and Digital Arts	Waterloo
Access to HE Diploma: Science Access to HE Diploma: Health and Human Sciences Access to HE Diploma: Medicine	Programme Manager: Science and Applied Science	Head of School: Humanities and Applied Sciences	Waterloo
Access to HE Diploma: Humanities Access to HE Diploma: Social Sciences	Programme Manager: Humanities and Social Sciences	Head of School: Humanities and Applied Sciences	Waterloo

Internal Moderation

All assignment briefs must be internally moderated prior to use. This will include a judgement as to whether the task enables the learners to meet the assessment criteria; whether the tasks are described clearly to the learner, so they know what to do; if there are clear limits (time/word count) to the tasks; and if the tasks are appropriate for the level.

Internal moderation must cover a sample of assessed work from all units, and from all assessors. The person responsible for the programme will have a schedule of internal

moderation including which students' work are moderated, when, and by whom. Moderation of assessed work will include checks as to whether all the assessment criteria have been met; whether the assessment criteria have been met; whether the grade is appropriate to the grade descriptors; and whether each grade has been considered individually. Moderators will also check that the student work has been annotated to show the achievement of the assessment criteria; that the language of the feedback to ensure it is consistent with the grade awarded; that the feedback is developmental to allow a learner to improve ready for their next submission; and that the feedback provided is directed to that particular learner.

Extenuating circumstances

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above and application form in [appendix 4A](#).

If work is submitted after the formal deadline has passed, and no extension has been granted (and there are no exceptional extenuating circumstances which explain the failure to request an extension), all grade indicators relating to that assignment must be capped at pass.

If an assignment is submitted after the deadline without an extension having been granted and the work does not meet the learning outcomes, there is no opportunity for resubmission except via the referrals process (see below).

Re-assessment/Resubmission

If a submission is not successful at the first attempt (that is, one or more of the learning outcomes for the assignment has not been achieved), the assignment is regarded as an unsuccessful submission. When a submission is unsuccessful, no credit can be awarded, it is not eligible for grading, and the grading process should not be applied. In these circumstances, the student should be offered the possibility of resubmission. There is only one opportunity for resubmission.

Resubmissions:

- the original submission must be returned to the student, with written feedback which explains which learning outcome(s) has/have not been achieved
- no feedback about the standard of the work in relation to grades may be given at this stage
- the specific requirements of a resubmission opportunity must be made clear to the student
- successful resubmissions must be graded following the same process as used for
- successful submissions and grades are given accordingly – only one resubmission opportunity may be provided for any individual assignment (unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted).

If the resubmission is unsuccessful (that is, the resubmitted work still does not meet the learning outcome(s) in full), the only means by which a further opportunity for resubmission can be provided within the same registration period is through referral.

Referrals

Normally, a student is permitted only one opportunity to resubmit work which fails to meet all requirements of the associated learning outcomes. The referral process allows the course team to recommend that a student should be permitted a second resubmission opportunity. Referral may also be requested for students who have submitted work after a deadline without an agreed extension, and this work has failed to meet the requirements of one or more of the associated learning outcomes. If this occurs within the duration of a course, the recommendation is referred to the lead/external moderator through the College's Access Co-Ordinator.

If the need for referral occurs at the end of the course (for example, as the consequence of assessments that have been taken in the last weeks of a course), the recommendation is

taken to the awards board, as referrals at this stage in a course have implications for staffing, resources and results that need to be fully considered and carefully managed.

Grading

The possible grading outputs for this qualification are: Pass, Merit or Distinction. The qualification is comprised of 60 credits: 45 graded credits at level 3, and 15 ungraded credits of study skills. Grades are confirmed at the final assessment board.

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. Transcripts will be provided by the AO Body and distributed by the Exams Office at College.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

Learners should not make appeals directly to OCN London unless they have exhausted the College's appeals process. Where a learner makes an appeal then they will be directed back to the Access Coordinator (the Quality Enhancement Manager: Access to HE and HE) to follow the internal centre appeals process. OCN London will request confirmation from the learner that they have appealed via the College first, if this has not happened, the learner will be directed to appeal through the College in the first instance.

All marks for the Access qualification are submitted at an 'Awards Board' (in July for September to June courses, in January for following year for January to December courses). Should a learner request an appeal post-Awards Board, the appeal must be made before 6th August if the learner has to confirm their university place. This gives sufficient time for OCN London to consider the appeal, request and externally moderate evidence and input any changes to results. The College therefore requests, learners follow the timelines as set out in section five of this document.

The final deadline when OCN London accepts work for external moderation for an appeal and AO within the same academic year is 30 September.

Fees

The registration fee for this course is included.

PEARSON – Higher National Certificates and Diplomas only

Please note:

- For other BTEC/Pearson provision at levels below 4 & 5, refer to the section below
- This information refers **only** to the qualifications on the Regulatory Qualifications Framework (RQF)

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for Pearson.

AO body website: [BTEC Higher Nationals | Pearson qualifications](#)

AO body email address: please complete the web enquiry form on the website [Contact Qualification Services \(pearson.com\)](#)

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

Handbooks, templates and supporting guidance are all available via [HN Global | BTEC Higher Nationals](#). Staff need to register their College email address to access.

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the curriculum teams.

Qualification	Subject Lead / Programme Manager	Head of Curriculum / School	Centre
Higher Nationals in Business	Programme Manager: Business, Enterprise and Vocational Training	Head of School: Humanities and Applied Sciences	Waterloo
Higher Nationals in Art & Design: Fashion and Textiles	Programme Manager: Fashion	Head of School: Visual and Digital Arts	Waterloo
Higher Nationals in Art & Design: 3D and Product Design (Ceramics)	Programme Manager: Ceramics	Head of School: Visual and Digital Arts	Waterloo
Higher Nationals in Art & Design: Photography	Subject Leader: Photography	Head of Media	Chelsea
Higher Nationals in Art & Design: Art Practice (Fine Art or Illustration, Drawing and Printmaking)	Subject Leader: Fine Art	Head of Art	Chelsea
Higher Nationals in Art & Design: Fashion and Textiles (Millinery)	Subject Leader: Fashion, Design and Communication	Head of Design	Chelsea
Higher Nationals in Art & Design: Fashion and Textiles (Tailoring and Streetwear)	Subject Leader: Fashion, Pattern Cutting and Construction	Head of Design	Chelsea
Higher Nationals in Music: Production, Technology, Artistic	Programme Manager: Popular Music	Head of School: Music and Performing Arts	Waterloo

Development or Performance	(Performance and Production)		
Higher Nationals in Performing Arts: Acting	Programme Manager: Drama	Head of School: Music and Performing Arts	Waterloo
Higher Nationals in Creative Media Production: Film or Sound Media	Subject Leader: Media Production	Head of Media	Chelsea
Higher Nationals in Creative Media Production: Visual Effects	Programme Manager: Digital Film, Photography and Media	Head of School: Visual and Digital Arts	Waterloo

Internal Verification

Internal verification of assignment briefs

It is a requirement that all assignment briefs are internally verified each year prior to issuing to students. The College is required to have copies of all the internal verification documents on file and available to the External Examiner.

During the course of the programme, internal verification sampling should cover the following:

- Every assessor
- Every unit
- Work from every assignment
- Every site
- Pass, Merit and Distinction achievement
- If applicable, a referred student or a student who has not yet achieved

Feedback from the internal verifier (IV) to the assessor should:

- Comment on feedback to the student
- Comment on effective (or otherwise) completion of documentation
- Provide developmental feedback on what could be improved
- If the internal verifier notes that action is required, the Assessor must complete this and return it to the IV for final sign off.

Internal verification should take place as soon as possible after assessment as this improves the quality of assessment practice and does not disadvantage the students. IVing of assessments must be undertaken before work is returned to students.

Extenuating circumstances

In accordance with the College's policy, the College may apply a grading cap to work that has been submitted late. However, the submitted work should be assessed 'without penalty' in the first instance, the late submission should be recorded, and the student should be made aware that the lateness of submission may have an impact on their grade. In addition, the student should be informed that they may wish to submit 'mitigating circumstances'; if there are circumstances that have related to the late submission. A decision can then be made (following the College's own policy) as to whether any exceptional/mitigating circumstances are accepted. Decisions will be ratified by the centre's Assessment Board or some form of Exceptional/Mitigating Circumstances Panel.

Resubmission

One resubmission is allowed if a student does not achieve a pass on first submission (same assignment). The reassessment opportunity will be **capped at Pass for that unit**. A student will not be entitled to be reassessed in any component for which a Pass or higher has already been awarded.

When splitting units across more than one assignment brief, it can be considered good practice to wait until all assignments have been assessed before offering the student a resubmission(s). This is because although the student may not have achieved all of the targeted assessment criteria and learning outcomes within one assignment, they may have achieved the missing assessment criteria and learning outcomes in a later assignment, even if that assignment did not directly target the assessment criteria and learning outcomes in question. Waiting until all assignments have been submitted before offering a resubmission(s) allows centres to holistically assess the student's performance for the entire unit across all assignment briefs, rather than reviewing the student's performance for each individual assignment brief in isolation.

Procedure for resubmissions

If the Programme Leader or Assessment Board does authorise a resubmission, the following conditions apply:

- The resubmission must be recorded in the relevant assessment documentation
- The student must be given a clear and realistic deadline for resubmission that is consistent across all students granted a resubmission. We recommend that students be required to resubmit work within 15 working days of the student being notified that a resubmission has been authorised
- The resubmission must be undertaken by the student with no further guidance
- The original evidence submitted for the assessment can remain valid and be extended, or may need to be replaced partially or in full
- Arrangements should be made for resubmitting the assessment in such a way that does not adversely affect other assessments and does not give the student an unfair advantage over others.

The programme team may opt to conduct a resubmission of the assignment under supervised conditions, even if this was not necessary for the original assessment. For example, this may be necessary to ensure that plagiarism cannot take place.

Plagiarism

In addition to the College statement on [Academic Malpractice and Plagiarism](#) in section 3 of this document, Pearson specify that students are not permitted to include text boxes in their submissions as these can dupe plagiarism detection software. Tutors must reject submissions which include text boxes, asking the student to submit in the correct format. Contravention of this will result in certification being withheld.

Grading

The possible grading outputs for this qualification are: Pass, Merit or Distinction.

Conditions for the award of the HNC:

To achieve a Pearson BTEC Higher National Certificate qualification, a student must have:

- Completed units equivalent to 120 credits at Level 4
- Achieved at least a pass in 105 credits at Level 4.

Compensation provisions for the HNC:

Students can still be awarded an HNC if they have not achieved a Pass in one of the 15 credit units completed but have completed and passed the remaining units.

Conditions for the award of the HND:

To achieve a Pearson BTEC Higher National Diploma qualification, a student must have:

- Completed units equivalent to 120 credits at Level 5
- Achieved at least a pass in 105 credits at Level 5
- Completed units equivalent to 120 credits at Level 4
- Achieved at least a pass in 105 credits at Level 4.

Compensation provisions for HND:

Students can still be awarded an HND if they have attempted but not achieved a Pass in one of the 15 credit units completed at Level 4 and similarly if they have attempted but not achieved one of the 15 credit units at Level 5. However, they must complete and pass the remaining units for an HNC or HND as per the unit rules of combination of the required qualification.

The calculation of the overall qualification grade is based on the student’s performance in all units. Students are awarded a Pass, Merit or Distinction qualification grade using the points gained through all 120 credits, at Level 4 for the HNC or Level 5 for the HND, based on unit achievement. The overall qualification grade is calculated in the same way for the HNC and for the HND.

All units in valid combination must have been attempted for each qualification. The conditions of award and the compensation provisions will apply as outlined above. All 120 credits count in calculating the grade (at each level, as applicable). The overall qualification grade for the HND will be calculated based on student performance in Level 5 units only. Units that have been attempted but not achieved, and subsequently granted compensation, will appear as ‘Unclassified’; i.e. a ‘U’ grade, on the student’s Notification of Performance, that is issued with the student certificate.

	Points per credit		Point boundaries
Pass	4	Pass	420 – 599
Merit	6	Merit	600 – 839
Distinction	8	Distinction	840 +

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above.

Repeat Units

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

- It is at the College’s discretion if a student will be offered to repeat a unit. This decision will be discussed and made at the Assessment Board only
- 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.

A student who, for the first assessment opportunity within a repeated unit, has failed to achieve a Pass for that unit specification shall be expected to undertake a reassessment. This reassessment will be subject to the standard RQF resubmission rules and regulations as stated above.

If a student repeats an RQF unit and still does not achieve a Pass in neither their first submission nor resubmission, they will be required to either complete a different unit in full or take the unit as compensation. In either instance, the centre must make sure that the relevant rules of combination and requirements have been met.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above.

Students have the final right of appeal to Pearson, but only if the procedures in place at the centre have been fully exhausted or if the student is not satisfied with the outcome.

As a higher education course, students also have the right to contact the Office for the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) to review their complaint. Students must have exhausted the College's internal complaints procedure and be issued a Completion of Procedures (COP) letter by the College. The letter will include details of how to get in touch with the OIA.

Fees

The registration fees for this course are included.

PEARSON BTEC – BTEC Nationals (level 3 and under)

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for Pearson BTEC.

AO body website: <https://qualifications.pearson.com>

AO body email address: fcentresupport@pearson.com

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

Qualification list and supporting documents-

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/btec-nationals.html>

Delivering BTEC guides –

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/delivering-our-qualifications/delivering-btec-qualifications/btec-forms-and-guides.html>

Key documents and role registrations relating to Lead Internal Verifier appointments and Standards Verification reports are held within Edexcel Online portal. Please contact the Head of Quality and Standards for access.

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery, assessment and internal verification of the BTEC qualifications accredited by Pearson sits with appointed Lead Internal Verifiers. These roles are fulfilled by Programme Managers/Subject Leaders, who are line managed and supported in this by Heads of School/Curriculum.

Qualification	Lead Internal Verifier	Head of Curriculum / School	Centre
Level 3 National Extended Diploma in eSports	Subject Leader for Media	Head of Media	Chelsea
Level 1 Introductory Award in Applied Science	Programme Manager for Science	Head of Humanities and Applied Science	Waterloo
Level 2 First Award in Principles of Applied Science	Programme Manager for Science	Head of Humanities and Applied Science	Waterloo
Level 3 National Diploma in Music Technology	Programme Manager for Popular Music	Head of Music and Performing Arts	Waterloo
Level 1/2 First Diploma in Business	Subject Leader for Business, Enterprise and Finance	Head of Business and IT	North Kensington
Level 1/2 First Extended Certificate in Business	Subject Leader for Business, Enterprise and Finance	Head of Business and IT	North Kensington
Level 3 National Extended Diploma in Business	Subject Leader for Business, Enterprise and Finance	Head of Business and IT	North Kensington
Level 3 National Certificate in Art and Design	Subject Leader for Music and Creative Arts	Head of Arts and Humanities	North Kensington

Internal verification

Internal Verification happens in several stages across the year when delivering and assessing Pearson BTECs. The BTEC Guide to Internal Verification is updated annually, published on the Pearson website and must be downloaded and read by all Lead Internal Verifiers at the start of every academic year. The Lead Internal Verifiers needs to make Internal Verifier appointment/s within their team to support the following steps that cover the process on annual BTEC Internal Verification.

- Lead IV registration and OSCA accreditation
- BTEC delivery team standardization activities and conformation
- Assessment Planning
- Internal Verification of Assignment Briefs
- Internal Verification of first submission grade criteria AO
- Internal Verification of second submission grade criteria AO

The specific details of each activity can change in line with the guidance each year, and therefore it is crucial that the BTEC Guide to Internal Verification is referred to by Lead Internal verifiers.

Extenuating circumstances

Special consideration for BTEC qualifications can be made in line with College policy, see [section](#) above, and in line with the [Pearson guidance](#).

Re-assessment/Resubmission

BTEC students are allowed one resubmission opportunity in line with the assessment plan if the following conditions are met;

- The learner met the first submission deadline or an agreed deadline extension
- The learner authenticated their work
- The Assessor judges that the learner can improve their work without further guidance
- The Assessor has authenticated the learner's evidence

If the learner meets the resubmission deadline but still has not achieved all pass level criteria, then one retake opportunity is allowed. The retake must fulfill the following conditions;

- A new task or assignment written that only targets the pass criteria
- The Assessor must agree a clear deadline
- The Assessor cannot award a merit or distinction grade
- The learner will not be allowed any further resubmission or retake opportunities

Grading

Pearson BTECs Level 1-3 qualifications are awarded overall with 1,2 or 3 grades depending on size at Pass (P), Merit (M) or Distinction (D). Extended Certificates are awarded one grade, National Diplomas are awarded two grades and Extended Certificates are awarded three grades. Unit are awarded final grades individually as either ungraded (U), P, M or D.

Individual qualification specification handbooks detail the exact methods of AO unit level grades and their value against overall qualification grades and these need to be read by Lead Internal Verifiers for each qualification delivered in order to award unit grades, track student progress and predict end-of-year achievement.

At a unit level, a student has to achieve all Pass criteria to be awarded a Pass or above and all Merit criteria to be awarded a Merit or above.

Example of an entire unit

Learning Aim A	Learning Aim B	Learning Aim C
The student has achieved all Pass, Merit and Distinction Criteria	The student has only achieved the Pass criteria	The student has achieved all Pass and Merit criteria, and some of the Distinction criteria.
In the above example the student has achieved a PASS for the entire unit. As they have not achieved Merit or Distinction criteria across all learning aims, they cannot be awarded a Merit or Distinction for the unit. If this was a first submission, and they met all of the conditions stated above, they could work toward Merit or Distinction overall in a resubmission.		

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above. Result also posted directly to the candidates if not collected in person.

Fees

The registration and examination fees for this course are included.

RAVENSBOURNE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for specified top up degrees at level 6 with Ravensbourne University.

AO body website: www.ravensbourne.ac.uk

AO body email address: info@rave.ac.uk

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

[Staff and student policies | Ravensbourne University London](#) however please speak to the Quality Enhancement Manager: Access to HE and HE for additional information if required.

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the Programme Manager/Subject Leader and Head of Curriculum.

Qualification	Subject	Lead/ Programme Manager	Head of Curriculum / School	Centre
BA Top-up Level 6 Fashion	Programme Fashion	Manager:	Head of School: Visual and Digital Arts	Waterloo
BA Top-up Level 6 Music (Performance or Production)	Programme Popular (Performance Production)	Manager: Music &	Head of School: Music and Performing Arts	Waterloo

Internal Moderation

Marking and moderation are the processes which are used to assess student performance and that grades awarded are accurate, fair and consistent. Marking of each assessment must match the grade descriptors for each band of marking. For individual assignments they indicate how well the assessment criteria have been met.

Moderation sampling (not less than 10%) is completed by an internal moderator using a sample of the assignments completed.

Additional moderation may be required where there are borderline marks between bands; where there are firsts or fails; or where there is a significant difference between the first marker and the internal moderator (second marker). Where there are significant differences (more than 10% difference) the link tutor will be asked to review the evidence of the 2 previous markers. If a resolution cannot be agreed to the grade conflict between the link tutor and the two internal markers or if there is no link tutor is in post, the External Examiner will be invited to resolve the conflict.

Double marking is required for units over 30 credits. Where double marking takes place the final overall mark must be agreed between the markers before it is released to the student.

Extenuating circumstances

Extenuating circumstances are personal circumstances that could not have been predicted, over which a student has no control over and have seriously impacted a student's ability to do assessments. Any student whose assessment is significantly affected by such circumstances may make an application under the College's [Extenuating Circumstances Policy](#). The outcome of an application for Extenuating Circumstances will be ratified at an Extenuating Circumstances Board attended by a member of Ravensbourne's Quality Team.

Re-assessment/Resubmission

Failure or non-submission in any assessment will result in a fail grade for that unit. Students must then successfully retrieve the failed assessment by resubmission of the assessment in order to pass the unit. Where a student does successfully retrieve an assessment failure, the grade for the assessment will be capped at D- [D minus, low Third] (except where Extenuating Circumstances have been approved). The overall grade for the unit will be calculated using all achieved grades where there are 2 or more assessments.

Where an Assessment Board has determined that a unit has been failed, a student shall be required to resubmit only in relation to the assessment item(s) s/he has failed within that unit. The Assessment Board may grant up to a maximum of 3 submissions: the first submission and 2 resubmissions to pass an assessment within a unit. There is no automatic right to any resubmission and the decision will be made by the Assessment Board. Should a resubmission be granted, the Assessment Board will make a recommendation that work should be completed in the Summer and be made available in the first week of September for marking and moderation, with the outcome presented to the Resit Board before the commencement of term. Students who pass the unit following the first resubmission of an assessment will be awarded the minimum pass grade of D-, if that was the only assessment for that unit. If the required standard is still not met, and at the Resit Board's discretion, second and final resubmission attempt can be offered. Should the student then pass, they would receive D- as the grade for that assessment if that was the only assessment component for that unit. The Programme Manager/Subject Leader is asked to speak to the Quality Enhancement Manager as to whether a new piece of work should be issued to capture the missed learning outcomes, or whether the original piece should be resubmitted.

Where an assessment board determines that no attempts have been made to submit any assessments for 2 consecutive terms (eg Term 1 and Term 2 or Term 2 and Term 3) and a student does not have a submitted recorded against all assessment items, no further opportunity to retrieve the work will be offered and the student's studies will be withdrawn due to academic failure.

There is no compensation available at level 6.

If a student has exhausted their resubmission attempts and therefore has failed the unit, and if the unit(s) value is 30 credits or less, the student may be offered to repeat the unit with the proportional fee required to be paid by the student. For students repeating a unit, attendance is required. Repeat students will study the same curriculum as the cohort they join. Should a student need to repeat more than 30 units, the Programme Manager/Subject Leader will discuss the student's individual likelihood of being successful at the Assessment Board to determine if the qualification can be achieved successfully.

In every case of resubmission, the latest assessed mark will be the mark which is recorded as the final mark. If a student receives a lower failing mark than at their original attempt after all retrieval attempts have been made, it is the later (lower) mark which will be recorded as their final mark. The only exception is if a student has extenuating circumstances approved by the Extenuating Circumstances Board, then that *first initial submission* will be marked as if for the first time. If a student submits Extenuating Circumstances for either the *first or second resubmission* and it is approved by the Extenuating Circumstances Board, then the grade will be capped but the cumulative submissions will not be increased (i.e. a student has 3 attempts - the original submission and 2 resubmissions at the Board's discretion, if the student has

approved Extenuating Circumstances for a resubmission then that would not count towards the cumulative total of attempts.

For 2021-22 enrolments onwards, should a student fail to meet the requirements of the level 6 award – after resubmission/repeat - a request will be made to the University to certificate the credit achieved. This will be through a letter confirming the units passed, the level and the credit achieved.

Grading

The possible grading outputs for this qualification are: First, Upper Second (2:1), Lower Second (2:2), Third, Marginal Fail, Fail.

100% of marks from level 6 will be used to calculate the final grade. All units must be passed for the student to be presented to the Assessment Board.

The final award classification indicates the level of achievement across the programme of study as a whole.

The classification of a student's award is determined at the point where that student becomes eligible for the award. Students are not permitted to take additional units in an attempt to improve their class of award, and no units may later be substituted with the intention of changing the award title or improving the class of award.

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above.

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with College policy, see [section](#) above.

Once the student has exhausted the College's internal appeals process, they can request a review by the University. The University will require evidence that the internal College processes have been completed. Please speak to the Quality Enhancement Manager: Access to HE and HE for details of how to progress the appeal. An appeal must be logged no later than 10 working days after completing the College's internal process.

Fees

The registration fees for this course are included. Should a student fail a unit and be offered to repeat that unit, a pro rata fee will be applied.

UAL AO BODY

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for UAL.

AO body website: www.arts.ac.uk/partnerships/ual-awarding-body

AO body email address: ual.awardingbody@arts.ac.uk

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

[Qualification handbooks](#)

Centre handbook –

https://www.arts.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0017/14462/Centre-handbook-v5.3.pdf

Key staff documents relating to advisory and moderation reports are held within the UALab QuartzWeb portal. Please contact the Head of Quality and Standards for access.

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualifications accredited by UAL sits with Programme Managers/Subject Leaders, who are line managed and supported in this by Heads of School/Curriculum.

Qualification	Subject Leader or Course Director	Head of Curriculum	Centre
Level 1 Diploma in Art, Design and Media	Subject Leader for Creative Discovery	Head of Art	Chelsea
Level 2 Diploma in Art and Design	Jewellery Tutor (Course Director)	Head of Arts & Humanities	North Kensington
	Fashion & Textiles Tutor (Course Director)	Head of Design	Chelsea
	Interiors Tutor (Course Director)	Head of Design	North Kensington
	Graphics (Course Director)	Head of Media	Chelsea
Level 2 Creative Media Production and Technology	Subject Leader for Media	Head of Media	Chelsea
Level 3 Extended Diploma in Art and Design	Subject Leader for Fashion	Head of Design	Chelsea
	Subject Leader for Creative Discovery	Head of Art	Chelsea
Level 3 Extended Diploma in Creative Practice: Art, Design & Communication	Subject Leader for Creative Discovery	Head of Art	Chelsea
	Subject Leader for Photography	Head of Media	Chelsea
Level 3 Creative Media Production & Technology	Subject Leader for Media	Head of Media	Chelsea

Level 3 Foundation Diploma in Art & Design	Programme Manager for Visual and Digital Arts	Head of School: Visual and Digital Arts	Waterloo
Level 4 Foundation Diploma in Art & Design	Subject Leader for Fashion	Head of Design	Chelsea
	Subject Leader for Creative Discovery	Head of Art	Chelsea

Internal Moderation

Internal moderation/verification is used as an independent check on the accuracy and consistency of the marks allocated by the original assessor for all internally assessed projects. The Subject Leader/Programme Manager will complete internal moderation for qualifications within their responsibility, and Heads of Curriculum/School will support in this.

All assessment evidence and original assessment decisions need to be safely stored and made available to UAL external moderators as required for Contact Points.

Records should detail the staff involved in internal moderation and when it took place.

Exceptional Circumstance

Tutors and managers can allow for the extension of the original agreed period for the completion of a project brief. This can be given when circumstances affect a student's ability to complete assignment briefs within allotted time or limit access to necessary facilities and equipment. Special consideration can be given in line with [UAL policy](#) (UAL policy currently under review).

Re-assessment/Resubmission

Failure to meet assessment criteria of non-graded units will lead to referral. Students are provided one opportunity to redeem a referral within a suitable period of time at the discretion of the course tutor.

Grading

Internally assessed units are non-graded and a student is awarded REFER/FAIL/PASS:

<u>Referral</u>	<u>Fail</u>	<u>Pass</u>
If a student provides insufficient evidence to meet assessment criteria, they are REFERRED. They have one opportunity to submit extra evidence within a timeframe.	If a student is unable to provide further evidence that meets the criteria, they will receive a fail grade.	If a student achieves all listed criteria, they receive a PASS.

Final qualification grades are awarded based on evidence submitted against the final graded unit. All internal assessment and grading decisions for this are subject to external moderation. The possible grade outcomes are PASS/MERIT/DISTINCTION based on evidence against criteria for each grade.

Referral and fail grades apply here also.

The Level 3 qualifications are worth UCAS points as stated;

L3 Extended Diploma in Art and Design	P72	M120	D168
L3 Extended Diploma in Creative Practice	P72	M120	D168
L3 Foundation Diploma in Art and Design	P80	M96	D112
L3 Extended Diploma in Creative Media	P72	M120	D168

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. See [certificates](#) section above. Results also posted directly to the candidates if not collected in person on results day.

Fees

The registration and examination fees for this course are included.

Template – for use for any new AO body that needs to be added to this document

TITLE OF AO BODY IN CAPS, BOLD, UNDERLINED

Introduction

Morley College London is an approved centre for **NAME OF AO BODY.**

AO body website: **XXXXXXXXXXXX**

AO body email address: **XXXXXXXXXXXX MAKE IT THE STUDENT VERSION**

Link to key staff documents/handbooks:

XXXXXXXXXXXX (although we would need to make sure this is updated each year if we want to include links to handbooks)

Course Team Responsibilities

Responsibility for the management of the delivery of the qualification/s accredited by the AO Body sits with the **Programme Manager/Subject Leader for Business, Enterprise and Professional Training** and the **Head of Curriculum for Business and IT.**

[IF YOU HAVE A COMPLEX LIST OF COURSES AND/OR PEOPLE OWNING THEM, INSERT A TABLE WITH 4 COLUMNS:]

Qualification	Subject Lead/ Programme Manager	Head of Curriculum / School	Centre
----------------------	--	--	---------------

Internal Moderation

In line with College procedures, [see section above](#) or **ADD IN IF BESPOKE**

Extenuating circumstances

In line with College policy, [see section above](#) or **ADD IN.**

Re-assessment/Resubmission

Add in info for your AO Body here.

Grading

The possible grading outputs for this qualification are: **LIST HERE**

Results

Results will only be confirmed once processed by the AO Body. [See certificates section above.](#)

Timelines for submitting an enquiry/appeal

In line with College policy, [see section above](#) or **ADD IN.**

Fees

The registration and examination fees for this course are included. **If there is a resit fee that we charge, add that information here.**

Appendix 2: Academic Malpractice Report Form

Academic Malpractice Investigation

Student under investigation:

Course:

Tutors:

Alleged Misconduct

State the type of alleged academic misconduct (eg plagiarism, collusion):

Provide background to incident of alleged misconduct:

Please attach a screenshot of work where possible

Initial meeting record

Please insert here any conversations/emails with the student which may have taken place around the misconduct. Include the dates of these conversations.

Programme Manager/Subject Leader

Date

Appendix 3: Conflict of Interest Log (use one per AO Body)

Academic Year	Course Name	Staff confirming check	Outcome	Date Checked	Logged by

Appendix 4: Extenuating Circumstances for Access to Higher Education and Higher Education Courses

- 1.1 An Extenuating Circumstance is a major change in circumstances or an acute worsening of a pre-existing state or condition which you had at the time of your enrolment.
- 1.2 If students on HE and Access to HE programmes feel unable to meet an assessment deadline due to extenuating circumstances, they may request an extension from the relevant Programme Manager/Subject Leader. A request is not a guarantee of approval for an extension. Student's attendance, previous commitment to the course, the reason for the extension request and the supporting evidence submitted will all be considered by the Programme Manager/Subject Leader when considering applications for extensions.
- 1.3 Students who already have an 'At Risk' action plan on eTrackr due to prior outstanding academic work need to demonstrate that they are complying with their action plan should they wish to request an extension.
- 1.4 The extension request must detail the reasons, before the day of the deadline, using a form ([Appendix 4A](#)) with supporting documentary evidence supplied.
- 1.5 Extenuating circumstances are normally limited to: substantial sickness or bereavement of an immediate family member (for example: partner, child, parent/guardian, or sibling). However other extenuating circumstances may be applied for from time to time, such as the effects of a pandemic on learning.
- 1.6 If an extension is agreed the Programme Manager/Subject Leader confirms the new date of submission by signing off on the new date on the assignment brief cover sheet. If the student is ill on the day of the deadline they must hand in the work on the earliest possible date following the deadline. The work will be classified as late unless supporting documentary evidence is included, such as a medical certificate. Where work is late without an accompanying extenuating circumstance, the College reserves the right to cap the mark awarded at a 'Pass'.
- 1.7 Retrospective extenuating circumstances: should a situation emerge at short notice which means you are unable to meet your deadline, for example attending hospital due to sudden accident or illness, please contact your Programme Manager/Subject Leader as soon as practically possible to let them know the circumstances. They will then contact either the Head of Quality Enhancement (HE) for HE courses or the Head of Performance Review and Enhancement for Access courses on your behalf informing the relevant Head of the delay and that you (the student) will be requesting an extension retrospectively. You will need to supply evidence to support any retrospective request.
- 1.8 The College is reluctant to add a further extension to an already approved extension period as then assessment workloads can become unmanageable. However, if there is a legitimate reason, with supporting evidence, for a second extension – such as a doctor's note supporting ongoing symptoms – the Programme Manager/Subject Leader can authorise a further extension. However, this is in exceptional circumstances and at the discretion of the Programme Manager/Subject Leader. If it becomes apparent that the student is unable to meet the deadlines for an extended period, the College-wide 'Fitness to Study' guidance should be used.
- 1.9 Extension Periods should be Minor extension 1 week, Major Extension 2 weeks (in year). If it's an extension post the academic year the Final Awards Board (for Access to HE) or the Assessment Board (for Higher Education) will agree the extension

period. In exceptional circumstances the Programme Manager/Subject Leader can approach the Chair of the panel to discuss and approve a longer extension or a continuing extension if the student's circumstances have not improved.

Please note however, if the issue preventing achievement is long term the College's 'Fitness to Study' policy should be used.

- 1.10 Please refer to the evidence matrix ([Appendix 4B](#)) as a guide to what supporting evidence will be accepted. For students with Additional Learning Support (ALS) in place, should there be a worsening of a pre-disclosed condition making it difficult to meet a deadline; or a new disclosure of a condition(s) impacting on meeting a deadline, the student is asked to meet with the ALS team to talk through the issues they are having. The ALS team can then liaise with the Programme Team via eTrackr to provide the supporting statement required as evidence. The Programme Manager/Subject Leader will review the statement and will make a decision as to whether the extension can be issued. The Programme Manager/Subject Leader may additionally review the student's attendance, engagement with the course, and the reason for the extension request when making their decision whether to grant the extension.
- 1.11 An extenuating circumstances panel will meet once a term to review the submissions and ensure there is consistency of practice across programmes. These will be scheduled for November (Term 1), January (Term 2), and April (Term 3), with a final session in mid-June to prepare for the end of the academic year.
- 1.12 After mid-June, any extenuating circumstances requests should be referred to the Final Awards Board (Access to HE) or the Assessment Board (Higher Education).
- 1.13 The panel will consist of the Head of Student Services and the relevant Head of Quality (HE or FE¹), the Programme Manager/Subject Leader will be invited to attend to go through the requests. A minute taker will also attend, and where there are requests for degree courses validated by a university partner, a representative from that partner should also be invited.
- 1.14 The Programme Manager/Subject Leader has the delegated right to agree an extension request with the student, following the guidance in [Appendix 4B](#). The purpose of the panel therefore is to consider whether a grade should be capped or not dependent on the reason for the extension request and the evidence submitted. The panel has the authority to cap the mark of submitted work at a Pass should they feel the request/supporting evidence was lacking.

1.15 Appeals

If a student disagrees with a panel decision they should write to the Deputy Principal within 10 working days setting out why they disagree with the panel's findings. The appeal claim must include new evidence. The decision of the Deputy Principal is final. Should the student not be happy with the outcome, they have recourse to appeal to their Awarding Body (for Access courses) and to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (for HE courses). Please refer to the College's Assessment Manual available on the Policy section of the College website: [Policies and Reports - Morley College](#). There is a section on appeals, and contact details for the relevant awarding bodies are provided.

1.16 Communication of findings

¹ For Higher Education courses, the Head of Quality Enhancement – HE will attend the panel; for Access to HE courses the Head of Performance Review and Enhancement will attend the panel

Decisions on whether an extension is approved/declines should be communicated to the student from the Programme Manager/Subject Leader within 5 working days of the panel meeting. The Programme Manager/Subject Leader must include reference to the appeal process noted in 1.15 above.

1.17 Extenuating Circumstances Log

Each Programme Manager/Subject Leader must update their extenuating circumstances log regularly and in advance of the scheduled panel meetings. This is to ensure that there is consistency of application of the requirements across the programme areas. The log is available in the 'Extenuating Circumstances Access to HE and HE' Microsoft Team but an example is given below for reference ([Appendix 4C](#)). Access to the log will be restricted to the Programme Manager/Subject Leader, the relevant Head of Quality Enhancement (HE) or Head of Performance Review and Enhancement and the Head of Student Services.

Appendix 4A: Extenuating Circumstances Request Form

Extenuating Circumstances Request

Access to HE and HE Courses Only

If you think that you will not be able to meet a deadline due to extenuating circumstances, you may request an **extension**. You must submit the request, explaining the reasons, **before** the day of the deadline to the Programme Manager/Subject Leader using this form with supporting **documentary evidence**.

Extenuating circumstances are normally limited to:

- Sickness
- Bereavement in your immediate family (for example: partner, child, parent/guardian, sibling)

If an extension is agreed, the Programme Manager/Subject Leader will sign your assignment coversheet and specify a **new deadline**.

If you are ill on the day of the deadline you must hand in the work on the earliest possible date following the deadline. The work will be classified as late unless you include supporting **documentary evidence**, such as a medical certificate.

Name:

I would like to apply for an extension on the deadline for the following assignment:

.....

The reason I cannot submit the work by the deadline on the assignment coversheet is:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Signature:

Date:

Programme Manager/Subject Leader:.....

Appendix 4B: Acceptable grounds and evidence when requesting extenuating circumstances

At Morley College London we aim to support students on their Access to Higher Education and Higher Education programmes whenever possible through requests for ‘extenuating circumstances’. As the term suggests, the cause of the request must be outside of your normal daily life for it to be considered.

Below is a table outlining what would and would not be considered as a request for extenuating circumstances. Students should refer to this matrix when applying for extenuating circumstances (EC) and consider whether it’s likely the EC will be upheld by the Panel. Staff should refer to the matrix to assist them, with the guidance helping the College apply standards consistently. This matrix is a guide and exceptions may be made by the panel if other evidence is available.

Staff are required to update their eTrackr notes on student circumstances regularly. These will normally be required by the panel when considering EC requests.

The timing of the request is vital. Requests made just before the deadline of an assessment (unless the event occurred just before) will be noted and the notice period will be scrutinised. This is to help students take control and plan their time effectively in a proactive rather than reactive way. For example, a court appearance would be planned for in advance and your tutor would expect you to be able to plan your time accordingly so that disruption is minimal, that is to say that you could still meet the intended deadline. If however your jury service was extended as the trial extended, you would not be able to plan for this in advance and it would be reasonable to request an extenuating circumstance extension to any assignment due in thereafter.

We do understand that in unexpected extenuating circumstances retrospective requests may need to be submitted. The Programme Manager/Subject Lead has the authority to grant extensions however these will be reviewed termly by the panel. The panel will scrutinise the requests, the evidence supplied and ensure that the practice is applied equally across cohorts. The panel reserves the right to ‘cap’ a grade should it find that the evidence is not sufficient or the request lacking.

Reason for requesting extenuating circumstances	Acceptable grounds	Examples of evidence required	Non-acceptable grounds
Medical	Personal injury, medical condition or mental health condition making it difficult to complete/submit work	Medical evidence – doctor’s note or invitation to medical appointment/letter following a medical appointment or supporting statement from Additional Learning Support department or a pdf of eTrackr action plan which provides evidence of this ongoing situation	Conditions that are on-going as these do not represent a change in circumstances (evidence of a worsening of condition would however be considered as a change). Choosing to have medical treatments

Reason for requesting extenuating circumstances	Acceptable grounds	Examples of evidence required	Non-acceptable grounds
	Injury/medical condition or mental health condition of a child, partner or close relative (such as sibling, parent/guardian)	Medical evidence – doctor’s note or invitation to medical appointment/letter following a medical appointment or supporting statement from Additional Learning Support department or a pdf of eTrackr action plan which provides evidence of this ongoing situation	such as cosmetic surgery. Minor illnesses such as colds, headaches, hay fever, cough.
	Worsening of an ongoing medical condition for self or child, partner, close relative (such as sibling, parent/guardian)	Medical evidence – doctor’s note or invitation to medical appointment/letter following a medical appointment or supporting statement from Additional Learning Services department or a pdf of eTrackr action plan which provides evidence of this ongoing situation	
Bereavement	Death of an immediate family member (for example: partner, child, parent/guardian or sibling)	Statement from tutor (this may be retrospectively applied)	
	Death of a close relative or friend	Statement on impact from student with supporting eTrackr notes. A copy of death certificate or similar may be requested. (this may be retrospectively applied)	

Reason for requesting extenuating circumstances	Acceptable grounds	Examples of evidence required	Non-acceptable grounds
Change in caring responsibilities	An unexpected event that disrupts care responsibilities, for example a condition to the dependent (child, partner, close relative such as sibling, parent/guardian) worsens	Medical evidence – doctor’s note or invitation to medical appointment/letter following a medical appointment Or Impact statement from students and supporting eTrackr Notes/Action Plan	Ongoing caring responsibilities which would be normal day-to-day activity Minor illnesses, injuries or accidents to the dependant
Jury Service/Court appearance	Court attendance – as jury member, witness, plaintiff or defendant.	Letter from court office with appointment details. If not applied for 7 days in advance a supporting statement must also be submitted regarding the motivations for attending.	If attending to support another attending court the panel reserve their right to use their discretion depending on the circumstances.
Traumatic event	Being a victim of a serious crime; theft of IT device required for submission; fire or vandalism at the property you live at; family breakdown.	Crime number and police report Or impact statement from student along with eTrackr notes.	Loss of devices; minor crimes; financial hardship as a result of employment issues; general domestic problems; anxiety over assessments unless exacerbating a known pre-existing condition
Other	Major disruption such as terrorist incident, flooding of housing, severe weather disruption preventing access to home, homelessness.	Evidence of disruption to travel (screenshot of train cancellations etc.) Or impact statement from student along with eTrackr notes.	Childcare/dependency care as a result of school closure/facility closure Holidays. Upload issues when the formatting requirements have not been followed or when internet disruption occurs immediately before deadline.

Appendix 4C: Example Extenuating Circumstances Log

Learner/Student name	Unit code or unit number	Unit title	Original deadline date	Reason for request	Request submitted through centre's EC process (yes/no)	Please list evidence supplied	Request approved (yes/no)	Request approved (initials)?	New deadline	Other notes

Appendix 5:

Recognising Prior Learning (RPL) Applicant Tracker Form

Morley College London supports students who are seeking to join a programme of study outside of the typical entry routes. This should be in the **best interests of their learning and future career**. The applicant tracker form enables the College to determine if an appropriate amount of learning has been achieved to allow mid-programme entry.

The RPL Applicant Tracker Form must be completed for all mid-year entry by a programme area manager, together with links to appropriate evidence of learning (ie certificates). The detail of this tracker should reflect the extent that different qualifications already support mid study transfer. For example many UAL qualifications are already designed to allow transfer between diploma and extended diploma stage.

Applicant Name
Date
Author (Programme Area Manager)
Link to onedrive/sharepoint record of achievement (certificates or evidence)

Details of former study	Destination
Institution Studied	Intended Destination Course
Qualification Completed	Qualification underpinning course
Qualification Number	Qualification Number
Units/Modules completed	Units/Modules completed by point of APL
Link to record of achievement (SharePoint/onedrive link)	

Accreditation Mapping

List individual units completed with their equivalency in the completed units of the destination course.

Where units do not directly map and original evidence (ie workbooks) is required include project references

Details of completed unit from originating qualification			Destination
Unit Title	Grade	Project Reference/details if required	Units satisfied in destination course

Has the applicant met all units on destination course?	
Has an in-depth advice and guidance meeting been help with applicant regarding mid-course entry?	
Have suitable targets been recorded on Etracker?	
Signature of Programme Area Manager	
Confirmation by Head of Curriculum	
Head of Curriculum Signature	Date