

Procedure for determining student performance and achievement: 2019/20

June 2020

Also available in large print (16pt)
and electronic format.

Ask Student Services for details.

www.perth.ac.uk



Perth College is a registered Scottish charity, number SC021209

Version Control History

Version Number	Date of Change	Summary of Revisions Made
0.1	25.5.2020	First draft of procedure
0.2	28.5.2020	Second draft with input from SDDs Definitions completed. Process for estimates for N5 and Highers added
0.3	1.6.2020	Amendments/comments by CE/SDD/JB
1.0	1.6.2020	Final version agreed

Student Achievement and Progression Procedure 2019/20

1. Purpose

- 1.1 To determine appropriate fora for the discussion, moderation and validation of course assessment and student achievement during the COVID-19 exceptional circumstances.
- 1.2 To provide guidance on the process for the moderation and verification of judgements that consider unit and overall student performance and achievement, and support consistency of decisions concerning student assessment and progression.
- 1.3 To enable the application of appropriate and specific requirements, as determined by the awarding body where relevant, when making judgements on a student performance and achievement.
- 1.4 To contribute to greater transparency of practice and demonstrate fairness, objectivity, equivalence and accuracy of decision-making for all students.

2. Scope

- 2.1 All courses (FE and HE) delivered by Perth College UHI will be reviewed at the course team meetings.
- 2.2 SQA awards that are networked across the UHI Partnership will be further reviewed and final judgement moderated at a partnership networked progression board¹.
- 2.3 UHI degree awards will be further reviewed and final judgement moderated by a UHI Exam Boards².
- 2.4 All remaining awards will be reviewed, and final judgement moderated at a College Progression Board.

3. Definitions

- 3.1 Judgement: this is a decision made by the course team on the overall achievement of course aims by a student.
- 3.2 Internal Quality Assurance Panel: this panel will moderate the judgements made by the course team to ensure the correct interpretation of awarding body assessment guidance has been used in determining a judgement.
- 3.3 Progression Board: this meeting will discuss and agree student achievement on units and their overall award and progression to further study or exit.
- 3.4 Moderation: review of evidence used to determine a judgement
- 3.5 Verification: confirmation of appropriateness of judgement made
- 3.6 By exception: where an alternative assessment and/or judgement has been used for a particular student due to mitigating circumstances

¹ As per UHI Networked Progression Board guidance

² As per UHI Exam Board Guidance

- 3.7 Exceptional Third Assessment: an opportunity for a student who has taken a resit opportunity on a failed first assessment attempt and failed again. The student may be offered an exceptional third attempt at the assessment if it this assessment is paramount to passing their overall award.
- 3.8 Mitigating circumstances: where a student is unable to attempt an assessment or submit at the due deadline due to exceptional circumstances.

4. Roles and Responsibilities

4.1 The Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) is responsible for:

- a. Arranging and chairing the course team meeting(s) within their curriculum area
- b. Ensuring that an appropriate assessment model is developed, agreed and implemented by the course team.
- c. Checking the accuracy and completeness of data on which decisions are to be based, such as:
 - i. unit and group award registration
 - ii. unit results
 - iii. deferral of assessment requested through mitigating circumstances
 - iv. granting exceptional third attempts
 - v. alignment of unit registration with the college approved framework
- d. Where relevant, for ensuring that estimates for National Qualification L5 and/or Highers:
 - i. are discussed by the team for each student and a final estimate decided upon, and that this decision is evidenced.
 - ii. consider statistical trend data and where the resulting estimates fall out with of this statistical data, clear evidence is available as to the rationale for the difference.
 - iii. are presented to the Sector Manager, or delegate, in time for submission to MIS by the deadline date.
- e. Ensuring that all assessment results for completed units are entered to SITS by the deadline date set by student records.
- f. Ensuring that all relevant documentation is available to members of the course team meeting to enable decision making.
- g. Ensuring that all output documentation from the course team meeting is complete and available in time for the College Progression Board. For example, agreed assessment model, by exception forms, mitigating circumstances IV10, exceptional third attempt IV9.

4.2 The Sector Manager (or Subject Leader) is responsible for:

- a. Approving estimates submitted by assessors for National Qualification Level 5 and Highers and that this data be submitted to MIS by the deadline given.

- b. Arranging and chairing the Progression Board meeting(s) within their sector area (or delegating this responsibility to a Subject Leader).
 - c. Ensuring that all relevant documentation is available to members of the progression board and IQA Panel to enable decision making. For example, agreed assessment model for information, by exception course forms, by exception student forms, overview of mitigating circumstances IV10, overview of exceptional third attempt IV9, core report for each course mode.
 - d. for verifying all decision making to the core report, for each course and mode of delivery, on outstanding unit achievement and course achievement.
- 4.3 The Sector Development Director is responsible for:
- a. ensuring that the staff in their curriculum area are aware of their responsibilities with respect to this procedure.
 - b. Verifying estimates submitted by assessors for National Qualification Level 5 and Highers.
 - c. acting as a member of an Internal Quality Assurance panel relevant to their curriculum area.
- 4.4 The Clerk of the Progression Board is responsible for:
- a. Giving relevant staff access to the Sharepoint site for documentation as relevant to their responsibilities,
 - b. Entering all decision making to the core report, for each course and mode of delivery, on outstanding unit achievement and course achievement.
 - c. Entering verification decisions by the IQA panel.
 - d. Producing a record of discussion of the progression board meeting.
 - e. Ensuring that all output documentation from the progression board meeting is completed and available for uploading to Sharepoint.
- 4.5 The Clerk to the Internal Quality Assurance Panel, where a separate meeting of the IQA has taken place outwith a Progression Board, is responsible for:
- a. Setting up relevant Internal Quality Assurance Panels to moderate and verify assessment judgements, as relevant.
 - b. Ensuring the panel has all relevant documentation for the meeting,
 - c. Producing a record of final judgements verified and discussion of the panel meeting.
 - d. Uploading all completed documentation to Sharepoint after the meeting
- 4.6 The Quality Manager is responsible for:
- a. providing advice and guidance on awarding body and external regulatory body guidance, as relevant, and for assuring that appropriate rules and regulations have been applied during decision making at the progression board.
 - b. For acting as a member of an Internal Quality Assurance panel, or ensuring an appropriate delegate attends on their behalf.
- 4.7 The Student Record Office will be responsible for:
- a. Uploading estimate results for National Qualification Level 5 and Highers.

- b. uploading to SITS unit results where these were not input by assessors prior to the progression board (see 5.3) and award achievement where these have been made based on a holistic judgement and are not generated automatically.
- c. For resulting the student achievements to the relevant awarding body

5. Procedure (Remit, constitution and decision making)

- 5.1 The Course Team will work collectively to agree upon appropriate assessment models for use during the exceptional circumstances of COVID-19 lockdown that supports evidence of student achievement of the course aims and if necessary, should meet periodically to determine changes to the strategy.
- 5.2 The following should be considered, and the approach documented:
- a. how the team is operating during the pandemic (this could include anything from all assessment being suspended, to all continuing)
 - b. what the team is doing in relation to amending candidate assessment plans in the current circumstances. (This would include determining where alternative arrangements to the published conditions of assessment are required for a unit and noting these on the relevant alternative assessment report and would refer to the Perth College decision tree.)
 - c. where relevant, how the team is dealing with observation and observation shortfall in candidate evidence for practice-based units ie what the team has agreed as acceptable use of other methods of observation, such as using video etc
 - d. how and when the team will review ongoing delivery and assessment of these awards during the pandemic
- 5.3 Relevant members of the course team (assessors) should submit to SITS their unit results for students who have either passed or failed their units. This will include where a unit does not have a clear pass or fail i.e. has been used as part of a holistic judgement based on discussions and agreement at the course team meeting. These students/units will be discussed at the Progression Board and all holistic judgement decisions verified and shown as holistic judgement on the Core Report. Core Skills and SfW results should be entered to the relevant spreadsheet and not to SITS.
- 5.4 The Course Team are to discuss and propose judgements on unit and course achievement for each student where:
- a. normal assessment strategy has been used,
 - b. a holistic assessment model has been used,
 - c. there are course or student 'by exception' circumstances,
 - d. student mitigation applications have been received,
 - e. a student is to be offered third assessment attempts.
 - f. awarding body guidance requires award certification to be deferred.

These decisions will be presented by the Course Team to the Progression Board for moderation.

- 5.5 The Course Team should include:
- a. The PAT, as Chair
 - b. All course assessors
 - c. All course internal verifiers
 - d. Student Support staff, as relevant
- 5.6 The members should produce the following as an output from their meetings which will be presented to the Progression Board for moderation and then validated by the Internal Quality Panel.
- a. Approach and framework used to assess students
 - b. proposed judgement on their performance and achievement, including deferred awards
 - c. Alternative conditions of assessment report
 - d. IV9 overview of proposed exceptional 3rd assessment attempt
 - e. IV10 overview of mitigation circumstances applications
 - f. By exception reports, per course or cohort, as relevant
 - g. By exception reports, per student as relevant
- 5.7 All evidence generated should be retained until December 2020 in case of external verification by the awarding body.
- 5.8 The Progression Board will moderate and agree a judgement decision made by the course team for each student on:
- a. Their unit achievement.
 - b. Their final course achievement.
 - c. Or, where required, assessment extension and course continuation and support.
 - d. Progression to the next level / graduation, where appropriate.
- 5.9 The Progression Board should include:
- a. Sector Manager, or Subject Leader, as Chair
 - b. Relevant PATs
 - c. Relevant Assessors
 - d. Relevant Internal Verifiers
 - e. Curriculum Administrator as Clerk
 - f. Student Record Officer
- 5.10 The following documentation should be used to inform their judgements:
- a. Approach and framework used to assess students to inform a final judgement on their performance and achievement
 - b. SQA changes to assessment report
 - c. IV9 overview of proposed exceptional 3rd assessment attempt
 - d. IV10 overview of mitigation circumstances applications
 - e. Previous course team meeting records of discussions
 - f. By exception reports, per course or cohort, as relevant

- g. By exception reports, per student as relevant
- 5.11 All decision making should be clearly documented, be risk-based and proportionate and confirm the validity and reliability of the agreed assessment strategy.
- 5.12 All evidence generated should be retained until December 2020 in case of external verification by the awarding body.
- 5.13 The members should produce the following as an output from their meeting:
- a. Completed core report for each course, and mode of delivery
 - b. Record of discussion of decision making
- 5.14 The Internal Quality Assurance members will work collectively to validate the decision making of the course team. This will include assuring a standardised approach has been made by course teams in their interpretation and use of relevant awarding body guidance to ensure objectivity, fairness and accuracy of assessment judgements at course level.
- 5.15 They will review and validate the final judgement proposed on student achievement, in particular those deemed to be by exception.
- 5.16 All decision making should be clearly documented, be risk-based and proportionate and confirm the validity and reliability of the assessment strategy.
- 5.17 The IQA should include:
- a. Sector Development Director
 - b. Quality Manager, or delegate,
 - c. Quality Officer, or delegate, to Clerk
- 5.18 The following documentation should be drawn upon by the IQA to validate judgements:
- a. Approach and framework used to assess students to inform a final judgement on their performance and achievement
 - b. Alternative conditions of assessment report
 - c. By exception report, per student as relevant
 - d. Course team meetings record of discussions
 - e. Core report for each course
- 5.19 The IQA should produce the following as an output from the verification activity:
- a. Record of discussion of final judgements
 - b. Verified decision on the core report
- 5.20 All evidence generated should be retained until December 2020 in case of external verification by the awarding body.

6. Linked Policies/Related Documents

6.1 Exemplar Documents

- a. Course Team meeting record of discussion
- b. IV9 exceptional circumstances

- c. IV10 mitigating circumstances applications
- d. Course by exception record of decision
- e. Student by exception record of decision
- f. Alternative Assessment Arrangements Report

6.2 Parameters of Decision Making

- a. [Colleges Scotland / SQA COVID19 Assessment Guidance for Colleges](#) (3 April 2020) (NB: this guidance includes non-subject specific PDA's and SfW.)
- b. SQA (adapted) Decision Tree
- c. Guidance on Alternative Approaches to Assessing Students 2019-2020

6.3 [SQA Accreditation – SVQ Assessment Guidance](#) (May 2020)

6.4 Awarding Body Subject Specific Guidance (refer to the relevant COVID-19 advice on the awarding body website)