# Al-Maktoum College of Higher Education

# Summative Assessment Policy

| Department/Team | Policy |
|---|---|
| Academic | **Academic Policy 011** |
| **Reference No.** | **Version No.** |
| ALM/ACD/POL/011/RV4 | 4 |

**Approved by:**

| Board/Committee | Date |
|---|---|
| Academic Council | 04.07.2024 |

| Date of next review: |
|---|
| July 2025 |

# Contents

ALM/ACD/POL/011/RV4      Summative Assessment Policy

# 1. Summative Assessments

Summative assessments are an essential part of the recognition of achievements and awarding qualifications.

Al-Maktoum College works in partnership with Abertay University, the University of Dundee and delivers qualifications awarded by the Scottish Qualifications Association. Each of these institutions follow different marking criteria, therefore these will be outlined in reference to the awarding institution.

## 1.1 Programmes awarded by Abertay University

The Grade Point Average (GPA) is an internationally recognised way of summarising a student's academic achievement, originated in North America, which is most commonly defined as the cumulative representation of the standard achieved by a student during and at the end of their degree as demonstrated through their performance in summative assessments of modules.

### 1.1.1 Assessment Scale (Abertay University)

| Literal Grade | Grade Point | Evaluative descriptor |
|---|---|---|
| A+ | 4.5 | Excellent overall. <br> Demonstrates an excellent grasp of the subject matter. <br> Excellent capacity for original and creative enquiry. <br> Excellent ability to critically evaluate, analyse, synthesise and integrate complex information. <br> Excellent communication skills. <br> In addition, exceptional in at least one of the above. |
| A | 4 | Excellent overall. <br> Demonstrates an excellent grasp of the subject matter. <br> Excellent capacity for original and creative enquiry. <br> Excellent ability to critically evaluate, analyse, synthesise and integrate complex information. <br> Excellent communication skills |
| B+ | 3.5 | Very good overall. <br> Demonstrates a very good grasp of the subject matter. <br> Very good capacity for original and creative enquiry. <br> Very good ability to critically evaluate, analyse, synthesise and integrate complex information. <br> Very good communication skills. <br> In addition, excellent in at least one of the above but overall performance deemed to be very good. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| B | 3 | Very good overall. |
| | | Demonstrates a very good grasp of the subject matter. |
| | | Very good capacity for original and creative enquiry. |
| | | Very good ability to critically evaluate, analyse, synthesise and integrate complex information. |
| | | Very good communication skills |
| C+ | 2.5 | Good overall. |
| | | Demonstrates a good grasp of the subject matter. |
| | | Good capacity for original and creative enquiry. |
| | | Good ability to critically evaluate, analyse, synthesise and integrate complex information. |
| | | Good communication skills in addition, very good in at least one of the above but overall performance deemed to be good. |
| C | 2 | Good overall. |
| | | Demonstrates a good grasp of the subject matter. |
| | | Good capacity for original and creative enquiry. |
| | | Good ability to critically evaluate, analyse, synthesise and integrate complex information. |
| | | Good communication skills |
| D+ | 1.5 | Satisfactory overall. |
| | | Demonstrates a satisfactory grasp of the subject matter but limited grasp in some areas. |
| | | Satisfactory capacity for original and creative enquiry. |
| | | Satisfactory ability to critically evaluate, analyse, synthesise and integrate information. |
| | | Satisfactory communication skills |
| D | 1 | Adequate. |
| | | Achievement of all threshold standards but grasp of some subject areas and graduate attribute development may be more limited. |
| MF | 0.5 | Marginal fail. |
| | | Performance just below the threshold standard. A reasonable expectation that a pass is achievable by reassessment without the need to repeat the module. |
| F | 0.0 | Fail. Performance well below the threshold level. Some limited evidence of achievement of the outcomes. |
| NS | | No assessments submitted |
| | | |

For all assessments which are not purely numeric (e.g. multiple choice tests), staff will allocate students a literal grade (e.g. A+, B, C+, MF etc) which can be entered on SITS and the corresponding Grade Point score will be allocated (4.5, 3, 2.5, 0.5 respectively). For purely numeric assessments where the provisional mark may be a percentage, guidance will be provided to staff on the corresponding grade point score and literal grade. All final marks should be in the form of a literal grade and a grade point score which is in subdivisions of 0.5 only.

## 1.1.2 Algorithms for calculating module results.

The Abertay University Assessment policy states that normally there should be a maximum of two units of summative assessment per 20 credit module and three for modules over 20 credits (exceptions apply which are articulated in the Assessment policy). Therefore, applying the literal grade point scale to modules which comprise of more than one unit of assessment, assignment of the overall module grade will be based upon the weighted average and rounding to the nearest 0.5 except in cases around the pass/ fail boundary where the average is less than 1.0. In such cases, rounding should not occur and the boundary for a module pass should be 0.75. This is also consistent with the boundary between a third class and marginal fail honours degree classification. Example 1: Module X comprises of two units of assessment. Assessment unit 1 is weighted at 40% and assessment unit 2 is weighted at 60%. A student scores a grade point 4.0 in unit 1 and a grade point 2.5 in unit 2. The weighted average is therefore 3.1. The overall module mark, recorded on the HEAR and which will contribute to the degree classification, is a B (3). Example 2: Module Z also comprises two units of assessment 50% 50% weighting. A student scores a grade point 1.0 in unit 1 and a grade point 0.5 in unit 2. The average is 0.75, which is less than 1.0 and therefore should be rounded up to 1.0. The overall module mark, recorded on the HEAR and which will contribute to the degree classification, is a D (1.00).

## 1.1.3 Algorithm for aggregating results and awarding degrees

GPA-based systems are founded on an average only, so the algorithm is fairly straightforward for the GPA. In addition, a student's profile of individual module marks for all stages of study will appear on the HEAR.

## 1.1.4 Reassessment

A minimum grade of MF (marginal fail) must be achieved in each unit of assessment, and a minimum of D overall, in order to receive a passing grade for a module.

Where a student receives an overall module grade of MF or F, a grade of F in a unit of assessment, reassessment will be available to them, once only, in each unit of assessment in which they do not yet have a passing grade, except in those units where reassessment is not possible (which will be set out in the module description). Where the fail grade is in a final dissertation or project, on resubmission will be permitted. There is no limit to the number of modules in which a student can be reassessed.

The highest grade that can be awarded following reassessment is D or Pass (where the module is a binary pass/fail). A student who has undertaken reassessment cannot be awarded a lower grade than that achieved at the first attempt.

## 1.1.5 Late submissions

Students may submit work up to 5 working dates after the published submission date or students with a valid reason, as defined the in the Mitigating Circumstances Policy, may apply for an extension to the submission date of 5 or 10 working days. Students without a valid reason, as defined in the Mitigating Circumstances Policy, may submit work up to 5 working days after the published deadline but the mark will be subject to a penalty as follows:

- Up to 5 working days after the published deadline – a deduction of 0.5 GPA for each working day from the actual mark achieved by the student (e.g. from C+ to F+, if an assessment is handed in on the fifth working day).
- After 5 days a grade of NS will be awarded
- No late submissions will be accepted for modules assessed on a pass/fail basis.

## 1.1.6 Feedback

- For all assessed work, including examinations, feedback must be provided to students.
- Feedback to students for all assessments submitted up to and including week 12 of a term is to be given within 10 working days from the agreed submission deadline without compromising the quality of feedback. For assessments to be submitted in weeks 13 or week 14 of each term (and for honours dissertation assessments) feedback to students is to be given within 15 working days. Staff must make the assessment return date clear to students at the same time as the assessment submission date.
- Module and programme assessments should be planned well in advance to enable these deadlines to be met, bearing in mind spread of assessment load, issues such as workload planning, team assessment etc. In rare cases (e.g. staff illness), where a module leader has determined that the feedback deadline cannot be met, he or she must seek approval for a short extension from their Head of Division (as line manager). If such approval is granted, students must be informed about the revised deadline. Feedback return date changes will be reported, at a high level, through division annual reports to SAC (Abertay School Academic Committee).

## 1.1.7 Number, types and timings of assessments per module

- Assessments should be designed to test the intended learning outcomes.
- Assessments in module descriptors ought to be clear and accurate using the correct
- Nomenclature
- For "class exams" outwith week 14, the module team is expected to provide invigilation, but this must be confirmed between the Module Leader and SAcS, (Abertay Student and Academic Services) as part of the timetabling process.
- All elements of summative assessment that a student must complete in order to meet the module's learning outcomes must be a unit of assessment in its own right. Normally there should be a maximum of two units of summative assessment per 20 credit module. Modules with >20 credits may have up to three units of summative assessment. Applications for exceptions may, however, be made on two grounds: a) Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements and b) Laboratory-based modules. In either case, applications must be submitted to the School's Academic Committee then approved by the Teaching and Learning Committee (Abertay)
- There is no limit to the number of formative assessments for any module and it is essential that students receive formative feedback and feedforward throughout the academic year. An early formative assessment in each module is strongly encouraged, especially for students new to the college/university (first year or direct entrants).
- Summative assessments within modules should be sufficiently spaced; normally at least two weeks apart.
- Programme teams must submit an assessment matrix annually to School Academic Committees (Abertay) that demonstrates minimisation of bunching and use of a variety of assessments which encourage active, deeper student learning.
- Students must receive information on assessment deadlines at the beginning of each term, in order to assist with their planning. Normally 12 weeks of material should be delivered within the term for each module. However, there is an expectation that students will undertake activities for the full 14 weeks.
- All assessments must be completed by the end of week 14 of each term.

## 1.1.8 Moderation

Internal moderation will be carried out on all assessments at all levels. Internal moderation must be documented to enable the External Examiner(s), Assessment Boards, Deans of School (Abertay),

Programme Leads (Al-Maktoum College), Heads of Division and any other external audiences to feel assured that internal moderation takes place and is consistent.

All assessment instruments must be pre-moderated prior to the start of each term. For SCQF levels 9 onwards these must be externally moderated no later than 3 weeks after the start of term.

All examination scripts and coursework submissions must be post-moderated by sample moderation. The exception to this is dissertations/final year projects which should be double blind marked and/or assessments/examinations with Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements which may be second marked or double-blind marked depending on the PSRB requirements.

Internal post moderation of student work is also required for resits.


Students are advised to also read the Academic Regulations for Taught Postgraduate Programmes 2023-2024: Academic Regs for Taught Postgraduate.pdf


## 1.1.9 Adjustment of Student Marks (Programmes awarded by Abertay University)

- All work should be internally moderated. Marks will be accurately awarded for the work submitted. Scaling should not normally be used at this stage of the process as it may lead to inconsistent treatment of students. However, if there is an exceptional reason why this needs to be done before the board meets, then the TQL (Abertay School Head of teaching Quality and Learning), the Chair, and if appropriate, the external examiner, should be consulted in advance and the decision should then be ratified by the SAB (Subject Assessment Board).
- Scaling will be applied during the Subject Assessment Boards (SABs). If no External Examiners are able to be present at the board and level 9-11 marks need exceptionally to be scaled, then information should be sent to them to explain the rationale for the decision and method used to adjust the marks, before the SAB so they can provide input into the Board's decision.
- The primary purpose of adjusting student marks is to ensure they properly reflect the academic achievement of students. Note that marks might be adjusted up or down to ensure students are not unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged by the original mark awarded.
- The primary purpose of mark adjustment or scaling is to correct anomalies which have arisen from unanticipated circumstances and is not to be used for norm-based marking.
- Scaling of marks should be applied to all affected students, normally the entire cohort who took the assessment.
- The application of scaling would not normally change the rank order of student achievement within an assessment.
- Normally the module leader would be the person who makes the recommendation regarding the scaling of marks however anyone at the SAB may make the proposal.
- Considerations when deciding whether to adjust marks:
  - Mark profiles informed by statistical data e.g. average, standard deviation for the past three years.
  - Range of marks is not in line with the performance of students on other modules.
  - Whether there is a good reason for a difference in performance e.g. size of the cohort which may make the statistics difficult to compare, students from different programmes all with different pre-requisite knowledge took the module in different years, or different engagement by students' patterns compared to previous years.

- o Issues with the actual assessment e.g. errors, unforeseen ambiguity in a question, unforeseen disruption during an assessment e.g. alarm during a closed book exam, or teaching was impacted by industrial action and whether any mitigating action already taken was seen as sufficient.
- A record of all mark adjustments will be recorded in the minutes for the meeting and will include:
  - o The module affected.
  - o Issue identified i.e. rationale for the scaling.
  - o Details of the scaling method in sufficient detail that is could be repeated.
  - o The students affected by the scaling process.
  - o Confirmation of External Examiner involvement
  - o Communications required to students to explain the action taken.
  - o Action required to ensure there is no reoccurrence in subsequent years if appropriate.
- Considerations when scaling:
  - o If marks are adjusted down, whether any mark should be reduced to zero – not recommended unless there is a good reason.
  - o If marks are adjusted down, whether any mark should be moved from a pass mark to a fail mark.
  - o If a mark (or module) was adjusted due to e.g. academic misconduct, late submission or a referral cap, then the original mark should be adjusted, and the capping or penalty reapplied.
  - o If the reason for scaling applies equally to referral or deferral e.g. original teaching was impacted, then the scaling should be applied to the referred / deferred assessment marks as well as the first sitting, unless there is a good reason not to do so.
- Scaling of marks should be considered prior to the SAB and outline recommendations should be documented in the SAB module report.
- Any scaling undertaken will be reported annually to the University Teaching and Learning Committee by SAcS.

## 1.2 Programmes awarded by University of Dundee

Students who are studying on programmes taught jointly with the University of Dundee follow their policies and procedures. The Assessment Policy for Taught Provision can be found here: Assessment policy for taught provision | University of Dundee, UK

## 1.3 Programmes taught by Al-Maktoum college and awarded by the SQA: HNC/D, Arabic Languages and Postgraduate Diplomas.

Al-Maktoum College's Assessment Policy for all programmes is as follows:

### 1.3.1 All HN Programmes:
**Achieving an overall pass**

The grading scale is from 0% to 100%. The pass mark for each assessed component of

programmes is as follows:

- All HNC and HND programmes: All units are assessed differently, and students will be informed of the marking criteria for each assessment. The final Graded Unit is based on the following grade boundaries:
  - A = 70%-100%,
  - B= 60%-69%,
  - C= 50%-59%,
  - below 50% is classed as a failure.
- Diploma in Management and Leadership: All units are assessed differently, and students will be informed of the marking criteria for each assessment.

### 1.3.2 Arabic Languages

- Introductory Certificate in Arabic Language (ICiAL), Certificate in Arabic Language (CiAL), Diploma in Arabic Language (DiAL):  45%. However, for students who want to progress from the Introductory Certificate in Arabic Language to the next level a pass mark of 65% is required. Students who receive a mark below 65% will be asked to take an entry test to be eligible for the following level.

### 1.3.2 Postgraduate Diplomas

Professional Diploma in Islamic Banking and Finance, Executive Diploma in Finance & Entrepreneurship, Diploma in Moral Economy & Sustainable Development. The grading scale is from 0% to 100%. The pass mark for each assessed component of programmes is as follows:

- Advanced Diploma in Islamic Studies:  45% is the pass rate, below this is a fail.
- All other Diplomas 50% pass rate, below this is a fail.

### 1.3.3 Academic Training Programme

The Academic Training Programme in Multiculturalism and Leadership (ATP): Students need to achieve a 50% minimum pass rate when all three written reports for this programme are averaged.

### 1.3.4 Re-assessment

- Students who fail a component at the first attempt of an assessment for any unit, will have the opportunity to resubmit (apart from the ATP students).
- Students who are successfully re-assessed will be awarded a mark of no more than 50% (capped), apart from the Graded Units on the HN programmes, where candidates will be awarded the highest grade achieved, whether through first sitting or reassessment.
- Students may be re-assessed in failed components only once, though the HN programmes allow two reassessment opportunities in exceptional circumstances.
- Students may not be re-assessed in an assessment that they have passed in order to achieve a higher mark, apart from on the HN Graded Units, where learners who wish to upgrade their award must be given one re-assessment opportunity.
- Students who fail a component may resubmit assessed work within:
  ***20 working days after the original submission date***

### 1.3.5 Deferred assessment (SQA programmes)

If illness or other exceptional circumstance prevents a student taking or submitting an assessment at the appropriate time, they may apply for a deferred assessment using the approved form.  Such applications will be considered in the strictest confidence by the Unit Coordinator and the Programme Coordinator who will decide if the application shall be granted and the conditions under which such

deferral is approved.  Normally, deferred assessments shall be undertaken at least one day before students who were assessed on time received their marked work.  If this is not possible, an alternative but equivalent assessment task must be set.  Students taking deferred assessments will be awarded the mark they achieve.

### 1.3.6 Feedback

Feedback is a vital part of the learning process. In summative assessments, constructive feedback is provided in written format. This will serve two purposes:

- it highlights the strengths and shortages of student's work; and
- it clarifies assessment decisions/marks.

### 1.3.7 Granting of extensions

The College aims to ensure fair and equal treatment in the assessment and exams of all students and that no student is unjustly denied or unfairly granted the benefits of continuous assessment. Therefore, upon completion of the approved form and with supporting evidence treated in the strictest confidence at all times, extensions will be granted in accordance with the following rules:

- Extensions of up to 7 days, with the inclusion of weekends, may be granted by the Unit Coordinator.
- Extensions exceeding 7 calendar days must be sent to the College's Academic Registrar for consideration.
- The Unit / Programme Coordinator may recommend to the Academic Registrar / SQA Coordinator the reduction or elimination of any penalty when made aware of appropriate extenuating circumstances. Students, who find themselves in such a circumstance, are therefore strongly encouraged to contact the Programme Coordinator as soon as they are able.
- Extensions are granted only where students have encountered exceptional or unforeseen difficulties or are subject to long-term episode of illness, or are affected by any relevant impairment, in the period during which they are expected to prepare their written work.
- When an extension is granted, the student will be given written confirmation of the extension and a copy of this confirmation and any additional information they might wish to provide will be retained by Student Administration.

### 1.3.8 Penalties for late submission of written work

- The College considers the timely submission of work **essential**. Therefore, any work submitted beyond the due date (**without** an approved extension) **will be penalised** according to the following schedule:

  > ***5 percentage points deducted per day*** *up to a maximum of 5 calendar days.*

- Submissions made over 5 calendar days late without an extension will receive zero for the grade.
- If a piece of work is due to receive a fail grade due to late submission (i.e. if the work would have passed, had it not incurred penalties due to late submission), then it will receive the minimum pass grade.
- Students must submit work via Turn-it-in on Moodle.
- Students should confirm that the written assignment is their own work by signing the appropriate declaration on the cover sheet that accompanies the assignment.

## 1.4 Reports/Essays

Any student who wishes to discuss their performance with the Unit Coordinator may do so by

making an appointment. Students are encouraged to do this as it can clarify issues about the style, form, and content of writing assignments. Students should be aware that the grades given are provisional, subject to ratification by the Board of Examiners.

## 1.5 Unit Coordinator's duties and responsibilities

The Unit Coordinators takes responsibility for:

- Teaching the whole unit(s) or the largest part of the unit assigned by the Programme Coordinator
- Setting assessment questions and activities, in collaboration with other colleagues if appropriate,
- Examining and marking assessed work, and
- Completing the Unit Coordinator Report and submitting this to the Programme Coordinator and / or relevant Committee.

## 1.6 Programme Coordinator's duties and responsibilities

The Programme Coordinators takes responsibility for:
- Coordinating the teaching responsibilities with teaching staff,
- Conducting peer review activities of the teaching staff to make sure the quality of teaching is met,
- Ensuring the security and arrangements for setting exam papers and assessments, including the content of examination papers; involvement in examining and marking assessed work; processing grades; and maintaining the quality and standards of marking,
- Providing a pastoral role for students,
- Completing the Annual Programme Review at the end of the programme and submitted through the relevant Committee. The Periodic Review should be conducted in accordance with the Annual and Periodic Review Policy.

# 2. SQA Coordinator's duties and responsibilities

The SQA Coordinator takes responsibility for:

- Supervising the activities of the Programme Coordinators
- Overviewing the quality and standards of design, delivery, teaching and assessment of the programmes
- Ensuring all Examiners and Internal Verifiers are aware of their responsibilities.
- Ensuring the accurate recording and actioning of decisions made by the Board of Examiners
- Ensuring that the College's programmes and processes meet SQA standards and requirements.
- Acting as the main point of contact between the College and the SQA

In practice, the SQA Coordinator will delegate operation of some responsibilities to Programme Coordinators, who will in turn delegate teaching responsibilities to Unit Coordinators. The Unit Coordinators will teach most of their respective units and be involved in assessments and internal verification, where appropriate.

## 2.1 Assessors' duties and responsibilities

The **First Assessor** of all assessed components of any module or unit is the one who teaches the largest part of the unit. Therefore, the First Assessor has subject knowledge and relevant skills of all assessed components of any unit is the one who teaches.

- In the case of joint teaching, the marking of assessments would be shared by the staff involved in teaching the unit.
- Assessors for the Academic Training Programme in Multiculturalism and Leadership *will have relevant and appropriate knowledge and skills of the subjects taught during the programme.*

## 2.2 Schedule of Markers (SQA Programmes)

**All SQA programmes**

Provisional grades must be made available to students 8 working days after the submission of the written work or exam: 8 working days for the First Assessor(s) and 4 working days for the Internal Verifier(s). Written assessments will be blind marked; and at least 20%, or a minimum of six scripts of all summative components of assessment should be double marked by the Internal Verifier(s). Unit presentations will not be double marked, but oral exams will. Any oral assessments cannot be blind marked.

**Academic Training Programme in Multiculturalism and Leadership**

- Assessment of the ATP reports will be shared mostly by the academic staff who contribute to the teaching of different sessions.
- Feedback must be made available to students 4 working days after the submission of the reports: 3 days for the First Assessor(s) and one day for the Internal Verifier(s). A selection (20%) of assessments will be double marked and blind marked. Internal Verifiers will be given a random sample of reports; or the reports for the internal verification may be selected by the academic administration staff from the lowest and highest marks.

# 3. Appeals

If any student believes the grading is incorrect, they are entitled to make a formal appeal against the grading. Students will need to follow the Student Appeals Procedure which can be found on our website: Student-Appeals-Procedures.pdf (almcollege.ac.uk)

# 4. Avoiding Potential Conflicts of Interest

No member of college staff, Marker/Examiner or Internal Verifier shall be involved in any assessment or examination in which she or he has a potential conflict of interest. Staff who believe there may be a conflict of interest must declare this by submitting a *Conflict of Interest Form* to the Academic Registrar.

All staff are responsible for reporting any conflict of interest, and the College will take measures to address this. This includes Assessors, Internal Verifiers, and Invigilators, who will:

- Set assessments which this candidate will undertake,
- Make assessment judgements on this candidate's work,
- Internally verify assessment decisions on this candidate's work, and/or
- Invigilate an assessment which this candidate is sitting.
- Staff should make a declaration if they are related to or have a personal relationship with a candidate, or are currently deployed to:
  - administer the application of this candidate to start a qualification at the College.
  - Administer the recording of the assessment marks.

- A personal interest in an outcome of an assessment amounts to conflict of interest, which poses a risk to the integrity of the assessment.
- Conflict of interest also applies where an individual stands to make a personal financial gain from the outcome of an assessment.

# 5. Assessment regulations for students with Additional Support Needs

The College is aware that its aim of securing fair and equal treatment in the assessment of all students is ultimately inextricable from disability–related issues and is, therefore, anxious to ensure that proper provision or reasonable adjustment is always made.  Students can help the College to achieve this aim by communicating any relevant information to Student Administration. At examinations, appropriate arrangements are made to meet the requirements of individual students with a disability – e.g. extra time, scribes, separate rooms, IT support. Alternative methods of examination are also arranged, when appropriate.

# 6. Transparency, Confidentiality and Security

Students must be given a clear statement of how and when each of their units/programmes is to be assessed.  The statement needs to be issued at the start of each unit/upon registration respectively.
- Assessments must be blind marked anonymously when possible.
- Examinations are conducted in an invigilated environment.
- It is the student's responsibility to ensure their work is legible.
- Grades and assessed work will be handled, recorded and stored securely.
- Student exams and assessments will be kept for a period of 3 years, after which they will be destroyed.
- In case of any resulting queries, candidate internal assessment appeals or suspected malpractice, the evidence will be retained for a period of 5 years.

**Review and Monitoring Process**

- During the yearly monitoring review of Assessors and Internal Verifiers (via _– the ALMC Assessment Code of Practice, Verification and Monitoring_), any IV or Assessor can give feedback to other Assessors.
- The assessment of each Assessor and IV will be monitored on a yearly basis at the end of the academic year and will be reported to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC).
- Information and the _Internal Verification Policy_, _ALMC Assessment Code of Practice and Monitoring_, and the _ALMC Verification Code of Practice and Monitoring_ will be provided to Internal Verifier's ahead of taking on the role.  These documents will be stored on Shared Drive.
- If further advice or clarification is needed, Assessors should contact their line manager, one of the IVs.

**Retention of the assessment documents**

An effective and documented system for the accurate recording, storage and retention of assessment records, internal verification records and candidate records of achievement in line with

SQA requirements and our partnering universities to ensure that accurate recording in the event of any future quality assurance enquiries and to minimise any risk of wrongful certification claims. Retaining documents also help to maintain national standards by allowing for the review of assessment over time. The College will store securely all assessment evidence in any format such as electronic, paper, visual or audio, for cases of malpractice or appeals for the required time. Detailed information on retaining different documents as well as their duration is included in the College's *Record Retention Schedule (Academic)*.

**'Student Route' Visa**

Students who are subject to immigration control may have restrictions as a result of the conditions of their visa. These supersede academic regulations on re-assessment timescales and extensions.

ALM/ACD/POL/011/RV4     Summative Assessment Policy