Marking Policy

iPET Network will only approve Training Providers with Tutors that meet the requirements to offer the qualifications. Initial assessment judgements against candidate evidence screened will continue until such time as the Internal Quality Assurance is confident that the Tutor can consistently make accurate judgements against the criteria. (Condition H1.1)

The Qualification Guides and Handbook for each qualification set each assessment that must be completed for the candidate to achieve the qualification, this provides credible evidence against the criteria and learning outcomes and therefore fairly reflects the competence of the candidate. (Condition H1.2) Tutors must take account of the general level descriptors for the Regulated Qualifications Framework (RQF)/ Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales (CQFW) as well as any assessment criteria and guidance provided for specific qualifications.

Where there are a range of different assessment tasks or methods used for determining the competence of the candidate against the assessment criteria, the only requirement is that the candidate demonstrates competence in keeping with the criteria. Therefore, if in the judgement of iPET Network, any specific task makes it more difficult for a candidate to demonstrate their legitimate competence against the criteria, feedback will be provided to the tutor and Reasonable Adjustments made to ensure that the candidate can demonstrate such competence that they have attained. (Condition H1.2). All Tutors and Quality Assurers must be confident that any assessment adjustments are consistently applied to ensure that the assessment criteria are secure for any particular Candidate, and that the demand is not greater than that required for a judgement against the assessment criteria. (Condition H1.3) See Reasonable Adjustments and Special Considerations Policy.

(Condition H2)

- Tutor provides Candidates with assessment brief and documentation from iPET Network specific to the specific qualification which is clearly mapped to the qualification criteria.
- Candidates use self and/or peer assessment to decide their capability against the criteria (If applicable to the qualification, this will be set out in the Qualification Guide)
- Grading is Pass or Fail only, review Qualification Handbooks for further information and guidance on re-assessment.
- Tutor verifies that Candidates match the criteria using any mandatory instruments required by iPET Network.
- Assessment evidence is uploaded to the Candidate's portfolio and then the IQA is informed that is ready for quality sampling. (Please note all formal practical assessments are sampled by the Internal Quality Assurer.)
- The Internal Quality Assurer will submit a request for the certificate once they are satisfied with the sampling.
- iPET Network External Quality Assurer reviews data and requests samples of candidate work as appropriate (Condition H2.1, 2.2).
- iPET Network External Quality Assurer checks samples against the standards and provides feedback to the Tutor and Internal Quality Assurer. (Condition H2.1, 2.2, 2.3)
- If there is a disagreement about the assessment outcomes, this will be disputed with the External and Internal Quality Assurers (Condition H2.1, 2.2, 2.3)
- Once satisfied the External Quality Assurer authorises awards and certification for candidates that meet the criteria. (Condition H2.3)
- Certificate is sent out to the Training Provider.

Each Candidate record on the iPET Network certification area on the Web Portal has a field for a Unique Learner Number (ULN). This field can be populated at the time of registering the Candidate or subsequently. The ULN enables iPET Network Candidate records to be transferred to other databases and

compatibility testing will be completed with MIAP. iPET Network will provide data in a format to transfer information to other legitimate databases as deemed necessary by the Regulator(s).

Levels for iPET Network qualifications are determined by assessment criteria in the RQF/CQFW. These are agreed between Awarding Organisations and referenced to the overall RQF/CQFW level descriptors. Cross-referencing takes place with other equivalent frameworks. This checking for levels and the key aspects that differentiate one level from another takes place at both the macro level of broad descriptors and at the micro level of using comparisons of work. This provides confidence that the (Condition H3) is secure.

iPET Network will abide by any adjudication made by the Regulators in relation to its qualifications in terms of specified levels of the qualification. In doing so the iPET Network is complying with the (Condition H4)

iPET Network requires that each Candidate provides credible evidence against the assessment criteria to their Tutor. Tutors must be confident that the Candidate's evidence reflects the minimum standard set by the criteria in the context of the RQF/CQFW framework or any other relevant framework to which the qualification belongs. iPET Network allows flexibility in the type of evidence provided based on the context and local conditions with the aim that the evidence is produced in contexts as typical as possible of working conditions e.g., Professional Discussions used to cover written question. The quantity of evidence must be sufficient for the Tutor to make a secure judgment. In any case where the Internal Quality Assurer believes the evidence to be insufficient, they will ask for more evidence taking in to account any evidence already received. All Candidates will be required to meet the same conditions in terms of providing evidence against the criteria. This then fulfils (Condition H5).

All results for all units and qualifications are recorded in an on-line database called the Web Portal and these can be verified from here using the unit certificate or the qualifications certificate number. The method of communicating results fits the standard RQF/CQFW structures. All results are based on the provision of sufficient and credible evidence that the candidate has matched the assessment criteria (Condition H6).

Document Control

Document Name: Marking Policy

Document Number: 43

Date of Correction	Version Number	Correction Reason
13/01/2022	2	Annual policy review