

# Assessment Policy

This document relates to the following Conditions:

- D1 Fitness for purpose of qualifications
- E4 Ensuring an assessment is fit for purpose and can be delivered
- G1 Setting the assessment
- G6 Arrangements for Reasonable Adjustments
- G7 Arrangements for Special Consideration
- H1 Marking the assessment
- H2 Moderation where assessment is marked by a Centre
- H3 Monitoring the specified levels of attainment for a qualification
- H4 Adjudication by Ofqual of specified levels of attainment for a qualification

## Contents

<b>Section 1</b>	Overview of the document
<b>Section 2</b>	Assessment in creative arts subjects
<b>Section 3</b>	External Moderation
<b>Section 4</b>	The role of the Centre
<b>Section 5</b>	Reasonable Adjustments
<b>Section 6</b>	Special Consideration and Aegrotat
<b>Section 7</b>	Your UAL Awarding Body contact for this document

## **Section 1 - Overview of the document**

### **1.1 Scope of the document**

This document is for Centres and External Moderators, and also students, and is designed to provide guidance on the assessment, external moderation and external verification of UAL Awarding Body qualifications.

This document relates to the qualifications shown below, and should be read by all those who are involved in their delivery and quality assurance:

- L3 and L4 Foundation Diploma in Art & Design
- L2 Award and Diploma in Art & Design
- L2 Award and Diploma in Performing and Production Arts
- L2 Award and Diploma in Creative Media Production & Technology
- L3 Diploma and Extended Diploma in Art & Design
- L3 Diploma and Extended Diploma in Performing and Production Arts
- L3 Diploma and Extended Diploma in Creative Media Production & Technology
- L4 Diploma in Fashion Retail
- L2 and L3 Awards and Certificates in Drawing
- L2 and L3 Awards and Certificates in Animation
- L2 and L3 Awards and Certificates in Photography
- L2 and L3 Awards and Certificates in Printmaking
- Film Suite Qualifications.

This document should be read in conjunction with the qualification specification and centre handbook documents available for each of these qualifications.

These documents are all available to download from the UAL Awarding Body website.

### **1.2 Purpose of the document**

This document sets out the underpinning approach and philosophy that UAL Awarding Body has to the assessment, moderation and verification of its qualifications. Given the nature of education in, and qualifications for, creative arts subjects, UAL Awarding Body believes that a particular approach is required in order to provide assessments that are fit for purpose.

This document also provides information on the mechanics of external moderation and external verification, and outlines the roles and responsibilities of the awarding body, the centre, internal assessors, moderators and verifiers and external moderators and verifiers.

### **1.3 Accessing the document**

You can download copies of the policy from our website here:

[www.arts.ac.uk/awarding/policiesandprocedures/](http://www.arts.ac.uk/awarding/policiesandprocedures/)

#### **1.4 Communication of the document**

UAL Awarding Body will ensure that all Centres have access to this document by making it available and prominent on its website.

UAL Awarding Body approved Centres must ensure all relevant staff involved in the management, assessment, moderation or verification of UAL Awarding Body qualifications are aware of their responsibilities in assessment, external moderation and external verification.

On their centre visits, our External Moderators and External Verifiers may check that Centre staff have received the policy and confirm that it has been disseminated to colleagues and students.

#### **1.5 Reviewing the policy**

UAL Awarding Body will review this document annually as part of its self-evaluation process and revise it as and when required in response to customer and stakeholder feedback, changes in our practices, actions from Ofqual or changes in legislation.

Our review will ensure that this document continues to be consistent and compliant with Ofqual's *'General Conditions of Recognition'* and that it is applied properly and fairly in order to arrive at fit for purpose assessment decisions.

## Section 2 – Assessment in creative arts<sup>1</sup> subjects

### 2.1 Approach to assessment

UAL Awarding Body believes that assessments of the qualifications in creative arts subjects should always be quality assured through the external moderation or verification of evidence generated by students to meet defined assessment and/or grading criteria. This ensures that the assessment is fit for purpose in the context of art, design and creative industries education, where evidence is generated in response to assignments or projects.<sup>2</sup>

UAL Awarding Body employs a team of expert External Moderators and Verifiers to carry out the external moderation or verification of the assessment decisions made by a Centre. A robust internal assessment process that includes internal moderation or verification must support the assessment decisions made by the Centre.

At the beginning of each academic year, the external moderation and verification team is reviewed to ensure that there is a sufficient number of each in place, and that they have sufficient expertise to carry out all external moderation and verification activities. External moderator and verifier requirements for new qualifications are considered as part of the qualification development process, and appropriate staff are identified and recruited prior to implementation.<sup>3</sup>

To ensure that the criteria against which students' performance will be differentiated are understood by External Moderators/Verifiers and applied consistently regardless of the identity of the External Moderator/Verifier, the student or the Centre, UAL Awarding Body:

- Provides all External Moderators/Verifiers with copies of the relevant documentation containing the learning outcomes and assessment/grading criteria (through hard copies and electronically via the UAL Awarding Body website)
- Requires External Moderators/Verifiers to attend standardisation events
- Requires new External Moderators to attend a training event
- Provides External Moderators/Verifiers with other CPD opportunities via UAL Awarding Body conferences, exhibitions and other events
- Monitors External Moderators/Verifiers via Centre feedback and Chief Examiner observation reports.<sup>4</sup>

Other forms of assessment, such as written examinations or multiple choice tests are appropriate for other sectors and subject qualification areas, but are much less appropriate for measuring the knowledge, skills and understanding developed via creative arts.

The production of a portfolio of evidence, a performance or other artifact or practical outcome in order to meet clearly defined assessment and/or grading criteria is the accepted method of measuring the knowledge, skills and understanding of students in creative arts subjects, and UAL Awarding Body fully subscribes to this.

There are no rules relating to the quantity or type of evidence that should be produced for any UAL Awarding Body qualifications. Guidance relating to the type of evidence that

---

<sup>1</sup> In this context, 'creative arts' includes all qualifications which relate to the creative sector – eg art and design, media, performing arts etc

<sup>2</sup> Evidence for Condition E4.2

<sup>3</sup> Evidence for Condition E4.1

<sup>4</sup> Evidence for Condition H1.1 and H2.2

should be produced is given in every unit within each of the specification documents<sup>5</sup>.

Due to the nature of assessment evidence in creative arts subjects UAL Awarding Body will always assess the majority of its qualifications via a visit – where an External Moderator (or team of External Moderators) or External Verifier will visit a centre for an appropriate length of time in order to make valid judgments about the Centre’s assessment decisions and ability to meet the National Standard for that qualification.

UAL Awarding Body does not assess, or carry out significant activities associated with assessment such as standardization, via postal arrangements, the use of digital images, video footage or other similar means.

UAL Awarding Body believes that an effective relationship between an External Moderator, defined as – an individual(s) appointed by the awarding body to ensure accurate and consistent standards of assessment across centres and over time - or External Verifier, defined as – an individual(s) appointed by the awarding body to confirm the validity of assessment methodology and decisions - and a centre is vital in ensuring that National Standards are met.<sup>6</sup>

Some UAL Awarding Body qualifications have a final grade. In these qualifications, grading is based on the student’s achievement in the final unit of the qualification, which represents the culmination of their learning. This rule is applied to all students taking the qualification. Grading is determined on the following basis:

- To achieve a Pass, students must achieve all of the Pass criteria
- To achieve a Merit, students must achieve all Pass criteria and all Merit criteria
- To achieve a Distinction, students must achieve all Pass and Merit criteria, and all Distinction criteria
- There is no compensation or condonement. Units are criterion referenced.

The rules for grading decisions are outlined clearly in qualification specifications, centre handbook and student handbooks where grading is used. These documents are made available to External Moderators/Verifiers, Centres and students in hard copy and electronically via the UAL Awarding Body website.<sup>7</sup>

## **2.2 Fitness for purpose of qualifications<sup>8</sup>**

UAL Awarding Body qualifications are designed and written via a rigorous development process by experts within the specific subject area. Qualifications adhere to the level descriptors described by Ofqual.

UAL Awarding Body ensures that each qualification it makes available is fit for purpose through securing the requirements of:

### **Validity**

Put simply, validity is about ensuring we measure what we intend. Assessments must provide the evidence that those who successfully complete them have met the aim or

---

<sup>5</sup> Evidence for Condition H5.3

<sup>6</sup> Evidence for Condition E4.2

<sup>7</sup> Evidence for Condition H5.4

<sup>8</sup> Evidence for Condition D1

purpose of the particular qualifications.

UAL Awarding Body qualifications all have a clear and specific purpose that informs and determines the design of the assessment instrument used to measure student performance. The validity of the assessment instrument and the approach to quality assuring assessment (and grading) decisions constitutes a considerable part of the process of designing and developing UAL Awarding Body qualifications. A very considerable range of individuals are consulted including Sector Skills Councils, employers, schools, FE colleges, HE institutions and students to ensure that the assessment will indeed measure what it intends to.<sup>9</sup>

Following the award of our qualifications UAL Awarding Body collects and analyses data that provides important evidence of the validity of the assessment and associated quality assurance processes. By collecting destination or progression data we are able to analyse and publish the extent to which students progress (to higher-level study or employment) as set out in the aims and purposes of our qualifications.

In other words, if the qualification is intended to support progression to Higher Education then the assessments must generate evidence (eg a portfolio of work, a performance etc) that can be used by Universities to make selection decisions about students. Each year we publish a Chief Examiner Report showing how well our qualifications achieve this.

### **Reliability**

The assessments of UAL Awarding Body qualifications are designed and quality assured in a way that supports consistency of outcome regardless of where or when they are delivered.

All UAL Awarding Body assessments are defined by pre-published, fixed learning outcomes and assessment/grading criteria described as a single QCF unit, rather than tests or examinations that are set annually or more frequently. As a result, the learning outcomes (defining what the student will be able to do, know or understand) and the assessment criteria (the standard upon which assessment evidence will be judged) remain unchanged requiring the same assessment process regardless of when or where it is followed.

To further support reliability and consistency in assessment decisions UAL Awarding Body:

- Publishes and distributes high-quality qualification documentation detailing specific assessment and quality assurance approaches for all of its qualifications
- Runs standardisation events where Centres and external moderators/verifiers can develop and promote a shared understanding of national standards
- Recruits, trains and evaluates external moderators in a manner that ensures consistent and repeatable interpretation of assessment arrangements.

### **Comparability**

A key component of UAL Awarding body assessments and quality assurance is the extent to which they generate outcomes that are comparable across centres, between qualifications and over time.

---

<sup>9</sup> Evidence for Condition D1



#### Comparability over time:

UAL Awarding Body monitors performance over time for all of its qualifications, paying particular attention to success rates and grade profiles (where qualifications differentiate between student performance). Data and associated analysis are published in the annual Chief Examiners Report.

#### Comparability across Centres:

UAL Awarding Body views comparability of standards across Centres delivering the same qualification as the mainstay of its quality assurance activities. Almost everything we do takes into consideration how we support comparability from the approach we take to approving Centres (only a very small number), the support materials we produce, the quality of our external moderators/verifiers and the training that they receive to the publication of our annual Chief Examiners Report.

#### Comparability across other awarding organizations:

The Foundation Diploma in Art & Design is the only UAL Awarding Body qualification that other awarding bodies offer. This qualification is offered by four Awarding Organisations; UAL Awarding Body, Edexcel, ABC and WJEC.

At this time, each of the four Awarding Organisations has slightly different versions of the qualification, although they continue to share the same primary aim and are perceived by 'users' as providing a similar experience. The awarding bodies meet biannually as the FFEAD (Forum for Further Education in Art & Design), and the principal aims of the group are to work collaboratively on future redevelopment work and ensure comparability of assessment via a number of mechanisms (eg shadowing on external moderation visits, attendance of standardization events etc).

UAL Awarding Body is in the process of developing a photographic archive of work which will allow the outcomes of assessments over time to be compared. The archive will place particular emphasis on grade boundaries to support the analysis of grade comparability over time.

Pearson awards qualifications at Levels 2 and 3 which are equivalent to UAL Awarding Body qualifications at the same levels in art and design, media and performing and production arts. The qualifications are used by Centres to serve the same purpose, but their approaches and assessment methodologies are very different. It may be possible, over time, to conduct exercises in comparability although this would be dependent on Pearson wishing to engage in this kind of activity.

#### **Manageability**

UAL Awarding Body designs and quality assures the assessment process for all its qualifications. It does however delegate the design of the specific assessment vehicle used to support students to generate assessment evidence to Centres. It does this within a defined context and usually in the form of an assignment. In art, design and media for example, this assignment might take the form of a project or brief. As a result, our assessments are always manageable for the Centre and the student in that they play a part in the design of the assessment instrument.

All of our Centres are asked about the manageability of assessment through our annual customer survey and are encouraged to feedback any issues to the Quality Officer.

**Minimising Bias**

The design of all UAL Awarding Body assessments is delegated to Centre level and, as a result, they are more likely to minimize bias. Assessments can be designed by Centres to take into account students with common attributes, ensuring that the assessment does not produce unreasonably adverse outcomes for those students.

Assessments must be designed to provide opportunities for the production of evidence against the learning outcomes and assessment/grading criteria defined by UAL Awarding Body. Learning outcomes and assessment/grading criteria are all developed in accordance with Equalities Law.

## 2.2 Setting the assessment<sup>10</sup>

UAL Awarding Body believes that assessment is an integral part of the learning process and that assessment in creative subjects must contain a component of objective academic judgment and not purely of computation possible in subject areas like mathematics. Assessment should be explicit, transparent, fit for purpose and ensure fairness of treatment for all students.

Assessments for UAL Awarding Body qualifications are always in the form of assignments or projects, which are determined at Centre level. In some instances, such as in the Foundation Diploma in Art & Design and the Extended Diplomas in Art & Design, Creative Media Production & Technology and Performing and Production Arts, the student will devise their own assignment or project which will be quality assured by Centre staff.

Delegating the responsibility for developing assignments and projects, the vehicles for assessment, to Centre level ensures that assessments can be delivered efficiently and in a manner which is cost effective. Assessments will therefore also only make use of the Centre's own resources as identified, and approved, during the UAL Awarding Body Centre Approval process.

All assignments and projects, whether devised by the Centre or the student, must provide appropriate opportunities for the student to generate the evidence required to meet the assessment/grading criteria for the unit or units that the assignment or project relates to.

For UAL Awarding Body qualifications which are graded, rather than Pass/Fail, assignments and projects must allow each specified level of attainment detailed in the specification to be reached by a student who has attained the required level of knowledge, skills and understanding.

The level of demand of an assessment for qualifications that UAL Awarding Body makes available is always determined, and only determined, by the learning outcomes and assessment/grading criteria set out for the individual units of the qualification. The level of demand for an assessment will therefore not change unless they change.

The learning outcomes and assessment/ grading criteria for UAL Awarding Body qualifications are made available to Centres and students in written documents (ie the qualification specification) which set the criteria out in a clear and unambiguous way, allowing students' levels of attainment to be differentiated. This allows internal assessors and external moderators and verifiers to accurately and consistently differentiate between a range of attainments by students.

The Centre must authenticate the evidence generated by each student by ensuring that each student has completed the 'Candidate Authentication Form', available via the UAL Awarding Body website.

---

<sup>10</sup> This section provides evidence for Conditions E4 and G1

## **Section 3 – External Moderation/Verification<sup>11</sup>**

### **3.1 Purpose of External Moderation/Verification**

The purpose of external moderation/verification is to determine whether centres are assessing accurately and consistently to agreed National Standards.

Moderation/verification is concerned solely with judging the quality of centres' assessment decisions through the external moderation/verification of internally assessed and standardised work. It does not necessarily extend to the provision of support and guidance to centre staff, although the process is likely to involve implicit support and guidance, through the generation of feedback reports containing recommendations and actions where appropriate.

### **3.2 The External Moderator/Verifier**

All UAL Awarding Body External Moderators/Verifiers will:

- Be appropriately qualified and experienced
- Have detailed knowledge of the awarding body's policies and procedures
- Have a good understanding of the qualification(s) for which they act as External Moderator/Verifier
- Act as a representative of UAL Awarding Body visiting allocated Centres to ensure that assessment and grading decisions are made on the basis of adequate and appropriate evidence
- Ensure that assessment decisions are fair, valid and consistent and free from bias
- Sample assessment evidence across art and design disciplines and grading levels appropriate to the qualification
- Report to UAL Awarding Body within an agreed time frame their conclusions and recommendations
- Attend standardisation and qualification reviews as required by UAL Awarding Body
- Be subject to quality monitoring and observation reports by the Chief Examiner
- Be subject to reallocation to Centres every 3 years or as deemed appropriate by UAL Awarding Body.

---

<sup>11</sup> Evidence for Condition H2.1

### 3.3 The external moderation/verification visit

The External Moderation/Verification visit will be carried out on the date chosen by, and agreed in advance with, the Centre. Prior to the visit, the External Moderator/Verifier will contact the relevant course leader to confirm:

- The date of the visit
- The names of people in the External Moderation/Verification Team (if there is one – relates to cohort size)
- The expected time of arrival – normally 10.00am
- The schedule for the day
- Any other requirements.

On the day of the external moderation/verification visit the External Moderator/Verifier will:

- Confirm that Candidate Authentication Forms have been completed for each student
- Review the Centre's approach to internal assessment, confirming it conforms to good practice as outlined in Section 3.6 below.
- Identify the sample, unless it has been agreed in advance as per Section 3.5 below
- View the assignment or project where it has been set by the Centre, or the project proposal determined by each student in the sample
- Review all available and admissible evidence for each candidate in the sample to ensure that grading and ultimately awarding reflect all the evidence produced for the assessment<sup>12</sup>
- Determine if agreed standards have been met or not
- Where standards have not been met and internal assessment decisions are considered to be incorrect, the External Moderator/Verifier will require the Centre to re-grade parts of the cohort, or the entire cohort<sup>13</sup>
- The External Moderator/Verifier will not change individual grades (please refer to Section 3.8 below for more information)<sup>14</sup>
- Extend the sample by 5% if further evidence is required to confirm that agreed standards are being met
- Confirm provisional grades with the Centre where agreed standards have been met

---

<sup>12</sup> Evidence for Condition H5.2

<sup>13</sup> Evidence for Condition H2.3

<sup>14</sup> Evidence for Condition H2.3

- Identify action to be taken where agreed standards have not been met
- Suggest recommendations which Centres can implement at their own discretion
- Provide additional feedback to the Centre, identifying areas for improvement or of good practice
- Agree the content of the written report
- Obtain a copy of the signed-off provisional grades
- Provide the Grade Confirmation Form for signatures.

If the External Moderator/Verifier agrees that the proposed grades meet the assessment and/or grading criteria then the Grade Confirmation Form can be signed by the External Moderator/Verifier and the Course Leader.

The completed Grade Confirmation Form will be forwarded to UAL Awarding Body by the External Moderator/Verifier, together with a copy of the signed-off provisional grades.

At this point, the Centre should submit their final grades to UAL Awarding Body via its online registration and certification system, Quartz. As this procedure represents the culmination of the entire assessment process, due care and attention should be taken to ensure that the correct, agreed grades are entered.

UAL Awarding Body will make the final decision to award the qualification on receipt of the Grade Confirmation Form and the signed-off provisional results from the external moderator/verifier, and the final grades from the Centre.

The Quality Manager will check the signed-off provisional results against the final grades from the Centre to confirm they have been entered correctly, and will then make a recommendation to the Awarding Body Management Group to award the qualification.

The External Moderator/Verifier will write a report outlining their observations and recommendations and/or actions and submit this to UAL Awarding Body within 10 days of the visit. The report should only contain information discussed with the Centre in the feedback session at the end of the visit.

Centres will receive a copy of the External Moderator/Moderation teams report via their quality contact. Centres may provide a response to the external moderation report to UAL Awarding Body.

Recommendations and actions to be taken by a centre should be completed within an agreed time frame.

### **3.4 The sample**

The moderation/verification sample for UAL Awarding Body qualifications is usually set at 10% of the cohort. This figure ensures that a sufficient number of sets of assessment evidence, covering all disciplines and a range of internal assessors, are externally moderated/verified.

On the day of the external moderation/verification visit, the External Moderator/Verifier will choose the sample that they wish to see, ensuring that it contains:

- Grades in all categories, Pass, Merit and Distinction where a qualification is graded
- Sufficient examples of the Referral category, to establish the Pass/Referral boundary
- A range of disciplines, reflecting the range of the qualification experience covered at the Centre
- Assessment evidence assessed by a range of internal assessors.

If, after reviewing the initial sample, the External Moderator/Verifier is uncertain that agreed standards are being applied to assessment and grading decisions then they must extend the sample by a further 5% of candidates.

If after extending the sample they are still uncertain that agreed standards are being applied to assessment and grading decisions then they must use the procedures set out in Section 3.7.

All Centres must make all possible efforts to facilitate external moderation. Work must be appropriately displayed and/or presented and clearly labeled.

### **3.5 Internally assessed units**

External Moderators, in addition to moderating assessment and grading decisions for externally moderated units are required to confirm through examination of relevant records that the internal assessment methodology for internally assessed units is rigorous and ensures assessment decisions are fair, valid, consistent and free from bias.

Practically, this means that Centres should provide External Moderators with:

- An outline of the structure of the course assessment and standardisation process (internal moderation/internal verification)
- Examples of assessment and standardisation records sufficient to enable the External Moderator to confirm that the methodology is working in practice.

It is recognised that different Centres use different methodologies and nomenclature specific to their culture. The Centre Handbooks for UAL Awarding Body qualifications outline some examples of good practice for the internal moderation of units. However, all Centres are required to ensure that their methodologies are suitably robust.

### 3.6 Referral

Centres that, after assessment and internal moderation of the internally assessed units within a qualification, identify a student's failure to meet assessment criteria must refer that student.

The Centre must identify to the student the assessment criteria which they have failed to meet and provide them with opportunities to work toward meeting those assessment criteria within a suitable period of time.

A student will only be allowed one opportunity to redeem a referral in each internally assessed unit.

In some qualifications, students must gain credit for the internally assessed units before proceeding to the internally assessed and externally moderated/verified unit/s. For example, in the Foundation Diploma in Art & Design, students must complete Units 1 - 6 before beginning Unit 7: Art and Design Project Proposal and Realisation.

If, when a student's work for an externally assessed unit is submitted it does not meet the pass (assessment) criteria, the Centre will refer that student using the following procedure:

- The Centre will inform the students of those assessment criteria they have failed to meet and confirm that they have been referred
- Records of all referrals will be recorded, discussed with the External Moderator and marked accordingly when results are submitted to UAL Awarding Body
- A relevant course tutor will agree with the student a time framed action plan for the submission of additional work required to meet the assessment criteria
- Centres will notify the Awarding Body of the final date for the submission of further evidence. The final date for submission of the required work will normally be mid – September but Centres may negotiate appropriate time-frames as necessary
- If the Centre's previous assessment and grading decisions have been agreed as meeting national standards then no additional visit from an External Moderator is necessary.
- Where there have been large numbers of referred students or other reasonable concerns, UAL Awarding Body reserves the right to arrange another visit by an External Moderator. The cost of any additional visit will be borne by the Centre
- A candidate will only be allowed one opportunity to redeem a referral and can only achieve a pass grade.



### **3.7 Failure to apply assessment and grading criteria to agreed standards**

If the Centre's proposed grades are found by the External Moderator / Moderation team not to meet agreed standards then the following procedure will apply:

- If a small subset of the sample is in question, (eg a particular discipline area, or a specific grade band) then the Centre team will be required to re-assess and re-submit the grades to the External Moderator/Moderation team for confirmation on the day of the moderation visit
- If the External Moderator/Moderation team is able to confirm that the re-submitted grades are now in line with the assessment and grading criteria then the Grade Confirmation Form can be authorised
- If the re-submitted grades are still not in line with the assessment and grading criteria, then the Grade Confirmation Form for the entire cohort cannot be signed. A second visit, within a reasonable timescale, will then be made by a second External Moderator/Moderation team.
- The cost of this additional visit will be borne by the Centre. If a resolution cannot be reached the Centre may appeal against the assessment decision
- Where over/under grading occurs across the entire cohort, or there is substantial inconsistency in the grading, then the External Moderator / Moderation team will recommend that the Centre team re- assess and re-grade across the entire cohort
- If this cannot be done on the day then the Centre and the External Moderator/Moderation team will arrange a mutually convenient time for a second moderation visit. The cost of this additional visit will be borne by the Centre
- If the External Moderator is able to confirm that the re-submitted grades are now in line with national standards then the Grade Confirmation Form can be authorised
- If the re-submitted grades are still not in line with the assessment and additional grading criteria then the Grade Confirmation Form for the entire cohort cannot be signed. A further visit, within a reasonable time scale, will then be made by a Senior External Moderator/Moderation team. The cost of this additional visit will be borne by the Centre. If a resolution still cannot be reached, the Centre may appeal against the assessment decision.

## Section 4 – The role of the Centre

### 4.1 Internal assessment

UAL Awarding Body requires each Centre to safeguard the validity of its assessment decisions by ensuring that it has a rigorous assessment and internal moderation/verification process which is clear and transparent.

In the process of making assessment decisions, Centres are required to review all available and admissible evidence for each candidate in the sample to ensure that grading, and ultimately awarding, reflect all the evidence produced for the assessment<sup>15</sup>

UAL Awarding Body provides its Centres with guidance and support to ensure that the assessment (in the form of an assignment or project) remains fit for purpose, and that the criteria against which students' performance is differentiated are being applied consistently and accurately by assessors in different Centres regardless of the identity of the assessor, student or Centre.

This guidance and support is provided in the form of:

- Free advisory visits by the Chief Examiner and Academic Advisor or appropriate member of UAL Awarding Body Staff
- Free copies of qualification documentation including the Specification, Centre Handbook and Student Handbook and access to them electronically via the UAL Awarding Body website
- Invitations to standardization events led by the Chief Examiner
- Invitations to free conferences, events and exhibitions to discuss best practice and to look at work produced by students.<sup>16</sup>

Some examples of good practice relating to internal assessment are listed below. The precise format of the assessment and moderation/verification methodology at any particular Centre will vary according to circumstance. External Moderators/Verifiers are required to make professional judgements as to the effectiveness and rigour of each Centre's assessment methodology.

- Assessment judgements are made by relating evidence to published assessment criteria
- Initial assessment decisions are made by a team of staff to ensure breadth of judgement although the exact number of assessors will be dependent on the availability of staff and course size
- Assessment teams include staff from art and design disciplines who have appropriate experience of the qualification and are adequately informed and supported to fulfil their responsibilities
- Blind marking, where staff make individual assessment decisions prior to communicating those decisions to other members of the assessment team, may be used to ensure greater objectivity

---

<sup>15</sup> Evidence for Condition H5.2

<sup>16</sup> Evidence for Condition H2.2

- Internal moderation/verification samples assessment decisions across all assessment teams and across a range of achievement to ensure that decisions are standardised
- The assessment teams have an opportunity to discuss all assessment and moderation/verification decisions
- All assessment and internal moderation/verification decisions, including all instances of Special Consideration and Aegrotat awards, are tracked and recorded providing evidence of performance over time
- The assessment and moderation/verification system is subject to regular review.

## Section 5 – Reasonable Adjustments

Standard assessment arrangements can be altered and adapted to reduce the impact of a disability that puts the student at a disadvantage. Given the nature of assessment in art and design, it would be expected that arrangements might be altered and adapted for a given student from the outset of delivery.

What is 'reasonable' is determined by a student's individual circumstances, the impact of the disability, and the cost and effectiveness of the proposed alterations or adaptations. The particular adjustment used will depend on the nature of the student's disability.

Reasonable adjustments fall into two categories:

- 1) Those that can be applied at the discretion of a Centre
- 2) Those for which the centre must apply to UAL Awarding body within 20 days of the student registration

Some examples of these two categories are shown below:

<b>1) Reasonable adjustment permitted at the discretion of the Centre</b>	<b>2) Reasonable adjustment requiring permission from UAL Awarding Body</b>
Change in the organisation of assessment rooms	Language modified assessment material
Use of coloured overlays, low vision aids, tinted spectacles	Assessment material in BSL
Use of bilingual and bilingual translation dictionaries	Responses in BSL
Assessment material in large format	Responses in Braille
Assessment material on coloured paper	BSL/English interpreter
Use of ICT	Other – contact UAL Awarding Body for guidance
Responses using electronic devices	

The assessment evidence produced by that student will be marked against the assessment and/or grading criteria in the same way as all other students.

Reasonable adjustments will not be considered if the achievement has already been claimed and certificated.

### Process

- 1) Centre identifies a disabled student who requires Reasonable Adjustments in accordance with equalities law, and collects and retains evidence to support decisions to implement suitable assistance
- 2) Centre determines whether the Reasonable Adjustment required falls into Category 1 or Category 2 as outlined above

- 3) If the Reasonable Adjustment is in Category 1, then the Centre must notify UAL Awarding Body in writing, via email or letter, who will record the relevant details in the 'SC and RA log' for that academic year.
- 4) If the Reasonable Adjustment is in Category 2, then the Centre must request permission from the Awarding Body prior to implementation. This should be done in writing, via email or letter
- 5) The request will be considered by the Awarding Body Management Group, who will explore the implications of the Reasonable Adjustment on external moderation and confirm that the reasonable adjustment will enable the student to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and understanding to the levels of attainment required by the specification for the qualification
- 6) The Awarding Body will notify the centre in writing, via email or letter, of their decision within ten working days of receiving the initial request
- 7) All relevant details relating to the request and its outcome will be recorded in the 'SC and RA log' for that academic year
- 8) The 'SC and RA' log will be monitored on an annual basis to ensure that requests for Reasonable Adjustments are being made appropriately

## Section 6 – Special Consideration and Aegrotat

Examples of circumstances in which a student may be eligible for special consideration include:

- Category (a) – an injury or illness such as a broken arm or glandular fever
- Category (b) – bereavement or other form of emotional shock.

Examples of circumstances in which a student is not eligible for special consideration include:

- Where personal arrangements impact on assessment or attainment
- Where preparation for the assessment is affected by environmental factors within the centre such as building work or staff shortages.

The special consideration given to a candidate will be the revision of the original agreed timeframe for the completion of the assessment, to allow them additional time. In most cases, this would mean that the candidate would be assessed on another occasion agreed with their Centre.

Responsibility for determining the need to apply special consideration, and the length of time appropriate, is devolved to Centres. They are best placed to make judgements on the specific circumstances of individual students. Centres must keep a record of the decision made, and of the evidence that supports this decision. Centres are expected to apply special consideration with integrity.

Centres must inform UAL Awarding Body of all decisions to apply special consideration in writing prior to, or as soon as possible after, their internal assessment process. The External Moderator must also be informed of all special consideration decisions at the start of their visit.

Notification of the decision to apply special consideration must confirm:

- That the centre has read and understood the Awarding Body's definition of special consideration as set out here
- The name of the student
- The ULN of the student
- The agreed timeframe for completion of the assessment

UAL Awarding Body will confirm to the Centre, in writing, that their special consideration decision has been accepted and recorded. The Awarding Body will monitor the use of special consideration over time, and will investigate its use within individual centres where necessary.

Students can achieve Pass, Merit or Distinction.

Special consideration will not be considered if achievement has already been claimed and certificated.

## **Aegrotat award**

Aegrotat awards may be awarded in exceptional circumstances, which may include chronic incapacitating illness or death. Aegrotat awards should only be considered where there is no prospect of the student ever being able to be reassessed.

Centres who wish to apply for an aegrotat award, on behalf of a student, must do so in writing giving a full explanation for their request. This must include:

- That the centre has read and understood the Awarding Body's definition of aegrotat awards as set out here
- The name of the student
- The ULN of the student
- Evidence to support the request for an aegrotat award.

The timings of such requests will be dependent on the qualification but must be made before any formal claim for certification is made.

UAL Awarding Body will confirm to the Centre, in writing, that their request for an aegrotat award has been considered, accepted and recorded. If necessary, the Awarding Body will request further information. The Awarding Body will monitor the use of aegrotats, and will investigate their use within individual centres where necessary.

Aegrotat awards can only be made if the student has generated sufficient evidence of achievement upon which to base the aegrotat assessment decision.

## **Section 7 – Your UAL Awarding Body contact for this document**

If you have any queries about the contents of this document, please contact:

Ross Anderson  
Deputy Director  
UAL Awarding Body  
Chelsea College of Art & Design  
16 John Islip Street  
London  
SW1P 4JU

Tel: 020 7514 9854  
Email: [r.anderson@arts.ac.uk](mailto:r.anderson@arts.ac.uk)