



# Chichester College Group Assessment Policy March 2024

[chichestercollegigroup.ac.uk](http://chichestercollegigroup.ac.uk)

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Scope and purpose .....	3
3. Principles of assessment.....	3
4. Assurance of academic standards .....	6
5. Systems to support assessment.....	6
6. Conduct of assessment.....	7
7. Grading and marking .....	7
8. Retention of Evidence.....	8
9. Appeals Process .....	8
10. Retention of student evidence .....	9
11. Review of assessment regulations.....	9
12. Authentication of student work .....	9
13. Monitoring of student progress.....	10
14. Academic Malpractice .....	10
15. Procedure for acting upon Academic Malpractice .....	13
16. Maladministration .....	15
Malpractice .....	19
Conflict of Interest Policy.....	20
Roles and Responsibilities in Assessment.....	23
Internal Verification Sampling .....	26
Extenuating Circumstances Form .....	27
Appeal Process.....	29
Student Appeal Form (example).....	31
Receipt of Student Portfolio, Assignment or Work .....	33
Resubmission of Evidence .....	34
Policy for the Use of ChatGPT and AI Chatbots .....	35
CPD for Staff.....	38
Sharing the Assessment Policy.....	39

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1. Assessment is at the heart of the learning experience of students. Progression through a programme and the validation of success or failure is determined by assessment.
- 1.2. Assessment can be:
  - **Diagnostic** - identifying a skill or attribute that suggests an appropriate learning pathway and identifying learning difficulties that require support.
  - **Formative** - enabling students to obtain feedback on progress and pointing out areas and strategies for improvement.
  - **Summative** - provides a clear statement about performance in relation to stated objectives.

## 2. Scope and purpose

- 2.1. The purpose of the policy is to set out the Teaching, Learning & Assessment the College commits to all students' groups enrolled at Chichester College Group.
- 2.2. The College recognises that different students' groups will have differing needs and this policy is designed to ensure consistent, effective and fair treatment for all.
- 2.3. The policy should be read in conjunction with other College policies and procedures including; The Student Code of Conduct, Equality & Diversity and Higher Education Policies.

## 3. Principles of assessment

- 3.1. The purpose of assessment is to enable students to demonstrate that they have fulfilled the stated learning outcomes of a unit, and they have

achieved the standard required for credit to be awarded in line with the providing Awarding Body's criteria. In most situations, assessment will quantify the level of performance by the use of letter grades (A-U), number grades (1-9), percentages or a pass / merit / distinction tier marking system.

- 3.2. Students should only be assessed against the published assessment criteria in the specification for the course. These are set in accordance with national standards provided in course specifications. It is very important that the teacher / assessor reads the requirements of the specification and makes sure the assessment is fit for purpose.
- 3.3. Students should be informed, in advance, of the assessment methods used along with an Assignment Plan for the course programme.
- 3.4. There should be appropriate methods for recording and communicating the outcomes for assessment and providing feedback for students. Where possible, feedback should be constructive.
- 3.5. The assessment arrangements for work placement exchange should be clearly communicated to students prior to commencing the relevant period of study and applied consistently.
- 3.6. Procedures must be in place for maintaining standards within the College and ensuring comparability between internal curriculum areas and the courses they run.
- 3.7. Marked work should be annotated to show where the assignment criteria have been met.
- 3.8. Assessment processes should be equitable, transparent, reliable and valid. A conflict of interest may arise when a teacher or assessor has a personal relationship with a student or trainee (such as a family connection, business etc.) this must be declared. Where possible work should be assessed by a different member of staff. If this is not possible all work assessed by that teacher / assessor for the student / trainee must be

subject to second marking or moderation. A note indicating the personal relationship should be recorded in the course file; it can be in the confidential notes if required.

- 3.9. If a student declares a disability or learning difficulty and it is believed that this would disadvantage their progress on the qualification, then the Additional Learning Support team must be contacted to check whether a reasonable adjustment or special consideration should be applied for. This must be completed before assessment begins. A reasonable adjustment will be applied if the student would otherwise be disadvantaged. Any adjustments must be agreed with the Internal Verifier, recorded as a note in the assessment file and shown to any External Verifier.
- 3.10. There should be regular standardisation / EV / IV, Lead Standards verifier / Lead IV meetings by the curriculum team.
- 3.11. Apprentice Assessor / Trainers / Lecturers

The following methods are examples of the different types of assessment which may be used to gather appropriate evidence to support grading decisions:

- Observation
- Professional discussion
- Photographic evidence provided by the student which shows them undertaking a relevant skill
- Gaining feedback from the employer - particularly in relation to behaviours
- Q&A
- Video & voice recordings - student would provide these recordings
- Reflective account
- Witness statements

- On programme assessment - real work evidence completed during the apprenticeship

#### 4. Assurance of academic standards

- 4.1. All courses offered by the College are subject to a rigorous process of both internal and external (awarding body) approval. This can be seen through monitoring measures such as, internal / external verifying, quality review and development visits and curriculum planning.
- 4.2. Responsibility for validation and review of courses is carried out by Study Programme Leaders, Heads of Learning, Internal Verifiers and External Verifiers.
- 4.3. Course validation and review panels consider the standard of the course against all relevant College and awarding bodies' criteria documents.

#### 5. Systems to support assessment

- 5.1. The College employs a rigorous routine for course monitoring.
- 5.2. The College has a very effective Quality Cycle embedded in Teaching and Learning. The cycle holds teams responsible for outstanding regulatory assessment processes.
- 5.3. Training is offered to all teaching staff to enable them to develop their knowledge and skills in the design of the conduct of assessment. This may take the form of Induction, Training events, Development days and workshops. The College has an exceptional CPD programme.
- 5.4. Standardisation and moderation meetings are held regularly to support staff in assessing in a fair and equitable way.

## 6. Conduct of assessment

- 6.1. At the start of the qualification, assessment guidelines should be distributed to every student.
- 6.2. The student's submitted work is final. Awarding body policies may allow for a resubmission or an opportunity to re-take the assessment. In order to award a resubmission or a re-take, the awarding body's policies and procedures must be observed.
- 6.3. If a student or the group is clearly not capable of successfully completing the assignment the teacher should suspend the assessment, resume teaching and then re-start the assignment when the students are ready to complete.
- 6.4. Assessment should be completed in a timely manner. If the student believes that they cannot submit work on time because of extenuating circumstances, they should apply for an extension to the deadline using the extenuating circumstances form in [Appendix F](#).

### 6.5. Academic misconduct

The College believes strongly in the importance of the integrity of academic conduct and takes all forms of academic misconduct seriously. Procedures have been put in place to deal with instances where students and staff are suspected of academic misconduct; if this case is proven, this can, in the most serious instances lead to exclusion from the College. Alleged staff misconduct in assessment will be managed using the Disciplinary procedure.

## 7. Grading and marking

- 7.1. All grades are to be given in accordance with the relevant awarding bodies grading system.

7.2. The main purpose of Internal Verification is to ensure that assessment criteria are being applied consistently, across individual units / modules and across the full course. Internal verification may take the form of double marking, team marking or sampling.

## 8. Retention of Evidence

8.1. Students should retain a duplicate copy of marked work either electronically or in a physical format for the duration of their course.

8.2. Original student evidence must be kept safe and secure for 12 weeks after students have been certificated.

8.3. Tracking documents / assessment records should be retained for 3 years.

8.4. *'It is important that evidence on which a student's grade is based, including copies of the student's work where available and any mark records, is retained safely by the centre; it will be needed to:*

- *Support the centre's determination of students' grades;*
- *The internal and external quality assurance processes;*  
*and*
- *The appeals process.'*

## 9. Appeals Process

9.1. A student may appeal against an assessment outcome in relation to:

- An individual unit or assessment
- Progression from one stage of a course to the next
- A recommendation for the final award

9.2. Students who wish to appeal are advised to do so within four working weeks of the assessed work being returned. Appeals after that time will be considered but students need to be aware that the college's ability to



change grades may be limited by the awarding body's regulations.

- 9.3. The College is committed to open and fair assessment. Students should be involved in the process of assessment. The purpose of the assessment and what is required to achieve a particular grade or level of competence should be clearly explained to the students. Similarly, constructive feedback should be provided, which clearly explains why a particular mark / grade has been awarded.

## **10. Retention of student evidence**

- 10.1. Students will be informed that portfolios may be required for inspection by the Awarding Body up to one year following certification, so may be required by the Assessment Centre.
- 10.2. Student portfolios of evidence, which remain unclaimed by the student after a period of one year, will be destroyed.
- 10.3. Copies of Awarding Body notification of achievement forms and certification records must be retained in the Examinations Office for a period of five years (or longer where Awarding Body regulations require).

## **11. Review of assessment regulations**

- 11.1. Quality review and development checks are carried out by the appropriate awarding body.

## **12. Authentication of student work**

- 12.1. On each assignment, students must sign that the work submitted is their own and teachers / assessors should confirm that the work assessed is solely that of the student concerned and was conducted under required conditions.
- 12.2. If the student hands in an assignment and teachers suspect it is not the

student's own work, the matter should be reported to the Teaching and Learning Manager, who must proceed in accordance with the Academic Malpractice section (14 and 15) of this policy.

### **13. Monitoring of student progress**

#### **13.1. The College will:**

- Keep systematic records of students' achievements, progress and attendance.
- Involve the students in self-assessment and reflection upon their own progress.
- Feedback to students on their progress and set specific targets for improvement.

### **14. Academic Malpractice**

#### **14.1. Notification of Malpractice**

Candidates will be notified about and warned against malpractice in a range of ways, including:

- The Colleges exam sites on the Student Intranet which include all relevant JCQ warning and notifications.
- Exam entry emails which link to the Intranet site.
- The College Parent/Portal which publishes the same information to parents and carers.

#### **14.2. Malpractice by students**

14.3. All assessable items must be the student's own work; where this is not so, it will be dealt with as a case of academic malpractice.

14.4. Academic malpractice is cheating: it is when a person (or people) trick,

defraud or deceive others. It includes the following:

- Collusion: where a student works in a fraudulent manner with another (or others) being assessed independently (either wholly or in part) in the same module.
- Plagiarism: to 'take and use another person's thoughts, writings, inventions as one's own' (Oxford English Dictionary). All quotations must use the Harvard APA referencing system.
- Commissioning: getting another person(s) to complete work, which is subsequently claimed as the student's own work.
- Impersonation: where somebody undertakes an examination or assessment posing as another person.
- Syndication: the submission of substantially similar piece(s) of work by two or more students, either in the same institution or in a number of institutions, either at the same time, or at different times.
- Falsification of data: where data has been invented, copied, altered or obtained by unfair means.
- Aiding and abetting: where a student assists another student in any form of dishonest academic practice.
- Professional misconduct: where, in the course of their assessed work, students on professional courses act in a manner that breaches the relevant professional Code of Conduct.

14.5. In all cases of academic malpractice or any other form of attempting to secure unfair advantage, Chichester College Group confirms:

- The right of the College to delay reaching a decision on a student's results until the facts have been established;
- The ability of the College to judge the seriousness of the academic misdemeanour and to exercise its discretion.

**14.6. Centre Staff malpractice may be committed by a member of staff or contractor.**

Examples of **malpractice** include:

- Failing to keep examination material secure prior to an examination;
- discussing or otherwise revealing secure information in public, e.g. internet forums;
- moving the time or date of a fixed examination beyond the arrangements permitted within the JCQ publication 'Instructions for conducting examinations'. Conducting an examination before the published date constitutes centre staff malpractice and a clear breach of security;
- failing to adequately supervise candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation; (This would apply to candidates subject to overnight supervision by centre personnel or where an examination is to be sat in an earlier or later session on the scheduled day).
- Permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination;
- failing to retain and secure examination question papers after an examination in cases where the life of the paper extends beyond the particular session. For example, where an examination is to be sat in a later session by one or more candidates due to a timetable variation;
- tampering with candidate scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments after collection and before despatch to the awarding body / examiner / moderator; (This would additionally include reading candidates' scripts or photocopying candidates' scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body / examiner).
- Failing to keep candidates' computer files secure which contain controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments.

- Releasing candidates early from a timetabled assessment (e.g. before 10 a.m. for a morning session examination).

## 15. Procedure for acting upon Academic Malpractice

15.1. Actions to be taken following a case of academic malpractice are as follows:

15.2. A minor case: e.g. presenting a short extract from a piece of work produced by another as one's own and not crediting the source. Need to follow 'JCQ Awarding Body Guidelines'.

- The case will be discussed with the student in a private tutorial with the subject teacher, Study Programme Leader and the Teaching and Learning Manager.
- The student will be given a warning about future action.
- Marks from the piece of work will be taken away (which may be 6% as a guide), or the student will have work returned to re-do and hand in for remarking.
- If this has happened before, the student will go straight to a second stage referral interview.
- If the student is working towards an exam, the relevant awarding body will be informed in accordance with the awarding body's policy by the Examinations Office.

15.3. A moderate case: e.g. Presenting a substantial extract from a piece of work produced by another as one's own and not crediting the source; fabricating data and using this within a piece of work which requires the collection of valid data or a repeat of an offence constituting minor misconduct.

- The case will be discussed with the student in a private tutorial with the subject teacher, Study Programme Leader and the Teaching and Learning Manager.
- The mark or assessment grade will be reduced or the student will be

awarded zero, depending on the severity of the case.

- The student may not be allowed to take the unit / exam / test again.
- The relevant examining body will be informed in accordance with the awarding body's policy by the Examinations Office.

15.4. A serious case: e.g. obtaining work done by another and presenting it as one's own; arranging for another to sit an examination in one's place; fabrication or falsification of research to support an analysis or a repeat of an offence constituting moderate misconduct.

- The relevant awarding body will be informed in accordance with the awarding body's policy by the Examinations Office.
- The case will be discussed with the student in a private tutorial with the subject teacher, Study Leader Programme and the Teaching and Learning Manager.
- A penalty will be awarded as agreed with the awarding body. The penalty will depend upon the seriousness of the offence. Any of the following may be given:
  - A zero grade in the exam / test / module is given or the assessed work is not awarded a grade
  - The student is disqualified from the course

15.5. In all cases, a note will be made on the student's file of the allegation, the outcome and any penalty awarded. This information may be used by the College when it is asked to provide a reference.

#### 15.6. Centre Staff Academic Malpractice

All allegations of malpractice or maladministration will be managed through the College's Disciplinary Policy and Procedure. The Examinations Office will inform the awarding body of the case in line with the awarding body's policy using JCQ Form M2 (b) or its replacement.

## 16. Maladministration

16.1. Failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework, examinations and non-examination assessments, or malpractice in the conduct of examinations / assessments and / or the handling of examination question papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, results and certificate claim forms, etc.

‘The awarding organisations will investigate credible allegations of malpractice or issues reported from our monitoring processes that raise concerns about a failure to follow the published requirements for determining grades. Examples include:

- Exam entries are created for students who had not studied the course of entry or had not intended to enter.
- Grades created for students who have not been taught sufficient content to provide the basis for that grade.
- A teacher deliberately and inappropriately disregarding the centre’s published policy when determining grades.
- A teacher fabricating evidence of candidate performance to support an inflated grade.
- A teacher deliberately providing inappropriate levels of support before or during an assessment, including deliberate disclosure of mark schemes and assessment materials, to support an inflated grade.
- A teacher intentionally submitting inflated grades.
- Failure to retain evidence used in the determination of grades in accordance with the JCQ Grading guidance.
- Systemic failure to follow the centre’s policy in relation to the application of Access Arrangements or Special Consideration arrangements for students in relation to assessments used to determine grades.

- Failure to take reasonable steps to authenticate student work.
- Failure to appropriately manage Conflicts of Interest (COIs) within a centre.
- Head of Centre's failure to submit the required declaration when submitting their grades.
- Grades being released to students (or their parents / carers) before the issue of results.
- Inappropriate members of staff assessing candidates for access arrangements.
- Failure to use current assignments for assessments.
- Failure to train invigilators adequately, leading to non-compliance with the JCQ publication 'Instructions for conducting examinations'.
- Failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings, e.g. JCQ 'Information for candidates' documents.
- Failure to inform the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of alternative sites for examinations.
- Failing to post notices relating to the examination or assessment outside all rooms (including Music and Art rooms) where examinations and assessments are held.
- Not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to the requirements as stipulated in the JCQ publication 'Instructions for conducting examinations'.
- The introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room, either prior to or during the examination; (N.B. this precludes the use of the examination room to coach candidates or give subject-specific presentations, including power-point presentations, prior to the start of the examination).



- Failing to remind candidates that any mobile phones or other unauthorised items found in their possession must be handed to the invigilator prior to the examination starting.
- Failure to invigilate examinations in accordance with the JCQ publication 'Instructions for conducting examinations'.
- Failure to have on file for inspection purposes accurate records relating to overnight supervision arrangements.
- Failure to have on file for inspection purposes appropriate evidence, as per the JCQ publication 'Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments', to substantiate approved access arrangements processed electronically using the Access arrangements online system.
- Granting access arrangements to candidates who do not meet the requirements of the JCQ publication 'Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments'.
- Granting access arrangements to candidates where prior approval has not been obtained from the Access arrangements online system or, in the case of a more complex arrangement, from an awarding body.
- Failure to supervise effectively the printing of computer-based assignments when this is required.
- Failing to retain candidates' controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments securely after the authentication statements have been signed or the work has been marked.
- Failing to maintain the security of candidate scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body or examiner.
- Failing to despatch candidates' scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments to the awarding bodies, examiners or moderators in a timely way.
- Failing to notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all

alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice.

- Failing to conduct a thorough investigation into suspected examination or assessment malpractice when asked to do so by an awarding body.
- Breaching the published arrangements for the release of examination results.
- The inappropriate retention or destruction of certificates.

## Malpractice

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the measures in place to prevent malpractice and other breaches of exam regulations, and to deal with such cases if they occur.

Where that proves impossible, the policy outlines how to handle cases in accordance with awarding organisation requirements.

- All staff involved have been made aware of these policies and have received training in them as necessary.

This section outlines the arrangements we have in place to ensure the relevant documentation and assessment evidence can be provided in a timely manner for the purposes of External Quality Assurance sampling and that staff can be made available to respond to enquiries.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the awarding organisation requirements for External Quality Assurance as set out in the **JCQ Guidance**.
- All necessary records of decision-making in relation to determining grades have been properly kept and can be made available for review as required.
- All student evidence on which decisions regarding the determination of grades has been retained and can be made available for review as required.
- Arrangements are in place to respond fully and promptly to any additional requirements / reviews that may be identified as a result of the External Quality Assurance process.
- Staff have been made aware that a failure to respond fully and effectively to such additional requirements may result in further action by the awarding organisations, including the withholding of results.
- For further guidelines, please see individual Awarding Body guidelines, for example, JCQ guidelines on malpractice and EAL guidelines on malpractice.  
[City & Guilds: Managing Cases of Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments](#)

## Conflict of Interest Policy

### 1. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance on handling possible conflicts of interest that may arise and so protect the reputation of the Chichester College Group (CCG) for high academic standards. It ensures compliance by CCG with awarding bodies' regulatory requirements and maintains the integrity of the Group.

This policy applies to all staff and other individuals whenever they interact or potentially interact with any of the college's operations.

### 2. This policy:

- Defines what is meant by conflict of interest in relation to assessment and sets out the roles and responsibilities for managing conflict of interest
- Illustrates of potential conflict of interest situations.

### 3. Scope

It is the policy of CCG that Lecturers, Assessors and Internal Verifiers acting on behalf of the college must be free from conflicts of interest that could adversely affect their judgment or objectivity to the organisation in conducting business activities and assessments.

### 4. Definition of Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest, for the purposes of this policy, is defined as a situation in which the professional judgment of an individual is compromised as a result of competing interests or loyalties. This may occur as a result of any of the following:

- Employees of CCG studying for an award that is assessed by colleagues.
- A relative, friend, colleague is a student for which a member of staff is responsible for assessment, internal quality assurance or invigilating an exam.
- Lecturers and assessors participating in the appointment, supervision evaluation or assessment of a person with whom the person, has close or familial ties.

- A person who is connected to the development, delivery or award of qualifications by the organisation has interests in any other activity which have the potential to lead that person to act contrary to his or her interests in that development, delivery or award in accordance with the awarding organisations conditions of recognition.
- An informed and reasonable observer would conclude that either of the above situations was the case.

## **5. Roles and responsibilities**

All relevant staff undertaking assessment ('assessors'), moderation ('moderators' or 'verifiers') and other individuals have a responsibility to be aware of the potential for a conflict of interest.

Such situations must be carefully managed to ensure that any conflict of interest does not detrimentally impact on the standards of the college and its awarding and inspecting bodies as well as public confidence.

It is the duty of all lecturers and assessors to disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest, to their Line Managers, in writing. The information submitted is then evaluated to identify, if any further action is required, and a written record of the outcome of the evaluation is kept and a copy will be provided to the concerned individuals.

If the individual concerned has any changes to their declared circumstances, they must inform their line manager immediately in writing, so that the conflict of interest can be evaluated, and the register updated.

## **6. Procedures**

The Curriculum Manager / Examinations team or the Teaching and Learning Manager will take steps to manage the conflict using any of the strategies below:

- In the first instance seek to appoint an assessor / invigilator / IQA who has no personal or professional relationship with the student(s).
- Ensure that any assessment carried out where there is a conflict of interest is internally quality assured by another member of staff.
- Inform the awarding body if the teacher is the only available specialist in that subject area to seek their permission and to arrange for any additional scrutiny to monitor fair and impartial approaches.
- Record the conflict of interest in the 'conflict of interest log' maintained by the examinations team and for Higher Education note conflicts of interests and strategies to mitigate risk in the exam board minutes.
- Provide details of conflicts of interest to visiting External Quality Assurers and External Examiners or others associated with the awarding body for the relevant qualifications

## Roles and Responsibilities in Assessment

### The role of the student

It is important that students understand the reason for producing their coursework and that they complete it on time, to ensure timely completion of the course.

- Students should be familiar with the assessment sections of their course handbooks and extended schemes of work.
- Through the Course Handbook, Schemes of Work and Assignment briefs students need to be made aware of assessment criteria for each project, assignment and unit.
- Their responsibility to meet assessment deadlines and submit all work for assessment as required in the brief.
- Attend for assessment when required and have all appropriate work available.
- Participate fully in group and individual assessments.

### Roles in Internal Verification

Are aware of the criteria for extenuatory circumstances if they are unable to meet the assessment deadline.

### The role of the subject teacher / assessor

The subject teacher is responsible for the assessment process in the units they are delivering, providing guidance to help improve students to improve, correcting common errors in English and Maths and ensuring vocational relevance.

### **The role of the internal verifier**

The internal verifier can be any member of the course team who has not been involved with the original assessment and who has:

- A good understanding of the relevant awarding body assessment requirements.
- Knowledge of the subject being verified.
- To be a critical friend and suggest improvements.

Guidance on internal verification sampling is contained in [Appendix E](#).

### **The Role of the Lead Internal Verifier (Edexcel) or Lead Internal Quality Assurer (City & Guilds)**

The Lead Internal Verifier / Quality Assurer role is key in securing assessment standards. This member of staff has the responsibility to oversee the internal verification of a specific group of courses, provide training for assessors and IVs and formulate assessment policies and processes in conjunction with the Quality Manager and the awarding body. The Lead IV will have taken and achieved OSCA accreditation. The Lead IV will have completed OSCA registration and the standardisation activity with the assessing team to be able to oversee the IV of their group of courses. The Lead IQA will have achieved qualifications required by City & Guilds. The Lead IV / IQA will ensure that all assessors working on the qualification attend and participate in standardisation activities. The Lead IV / IQA will implement a risk based IV process, providing feedback on good practice and support for assessors.

The Lead IV will have:

- A good understanding of the relevant awarding body assessment and verification requirements.



- OSCA accreditation or be in the process of gaining OSCA accreditation completed OSCA registration and the standardisation activity with the assessing team.
- Completed the annual registration as a Lead IV, in September 2023.
- Knowledge of the subject being verified.

### **The Role of the Exams Office**

- To meet the deadlines for registering students with the awarding body.
- To ensure that awarding body data is kept up to date with timely withdrawal or transfer of students.
- To claim students' certificates.
- To claim unit certification when a student has not been able to complete the full programme of study.
- To ensure that all qualifications have relevant awarding body approval.

## Internal Verification Sampling

IV sample plans should ensure that ALL assignments / assessments are checked and IV paperwork completed and returned.

There should be a 20% IV sample of the assessed work for each assignment / assessment.

***By the time the course has been completed:***

All students should have had at least 1 unit of work internally verified.

All teachers should have had at least 1 unit of work internally verified.

## Extenuating Circumstances Form Confidential

(Example - adapt to centre requirements)

Write in **BLOCK CAPITALS** your name and the address to which you wish the outcome to be sent.

Student registration			
Last Name			
Forename(s)			
Course			
Reason for requesting extenuating circumstances (see guidance on next page)	What is being requested? (e.g. later submission date)		

### Evidence

Description (what e.g.	Evidence (e.g. doctor's note)	Date
	List here all the documents attached	

Please note your case cannot be considered unless all of the columns above are completed.

### Unit Affected

Unit affected	Assignment	Staff use only			
		Due date	Valid	Invalid	Reason(s)

Decision	
Signature	
Date	

Please allow five working days for a decision, emergency situations will be prioritised to be dealt with as quickly as possible.

### **What are extenuating circumstances?**

These are any unexpected situations which have a serious impact upon a student's ability to complete assessments. For example: a serious illness for the student (or someone for whom the student has primary caring responsibilities). To be considered serious the illness would require a doctor's note requiring complete rest or hospitalisation. Death of a close personal relative would qualify. Transport disruption caused by an unexpected event such as failure of trains.

The following do not qualify as extenuating circumstances: losing the work to be assessed because of computer failure, or loss or malfunctioning of a memory stick or other storage device, the student should have work backed up in several locations including the cloud storage provided by the college. Minor illnesses or long standing medical conditions are not extenuating circumstances, however the latter should be considered in planning reasonable adjustments by the teaching and assessing team.

Transport disruption caused by planned strikes would not count. Moving house or holidays are not extenuating circumstances.

## Appeal Process

### Stage One

If a student disagrees with an assessment decision, the student should be invited to discuss it with the assessor as soon as possible. The student should be invited to explain the reasons for concern, and to re-examine the work or evidence with the assessor. The assessor should explain fully the reasons for the grade and listen carefully to the points made by the student, taking due account of them in their consideration of whether there is a case for changing the grade. It is expected that most appeals will proceed no further than this.

### Stage Two

If the student is still unhappy about an assessment decision after stage one has been carried out, they should be invited to complete a 'Student Appeal Form' [Appendix H](#). This should be submitted with the student work or evidence and any explanation the student may wish to include, to the internal verifier within three working days of the receipt of the returned work. The internal verifier will reconsider the decision and inform the student of their decision within five working days. If the assignment has already been internally verified, the lecturer will ask another colleague to blind double mark it. The decision will also be entered on the "Student Appeal Form".

In the event that the student is unhappy about the reconsidered assessment, the appeal will move to stage three.

### Stage Three

At this stage the 'Student Appeal Form' and relevant evidence will be sent to an Appeal Panel, which will include the student, a friend (if the student so wishes), the original assessor, the internal verifier (from Stage Two) and two independent members appointed by the Teaching and Learning Manager, one of

whom will be appointed as Chair. The Panel will meet at a time convenient to the student. The Panel will reach a decision within ten working days of the meeting of the Panel and notify, in writing, all parties of the outcome.

### Student Appeal Form (example)

To be updated once all Awarding Body requirements have been received

<b>Name of Student</b>	
<b>Programme Title</b>	

<b>Name of Assessor</b>	
<b>Name of Internal Verifier</b>	

<b>Unit Assessed</b>	
<b>Nature / Title of Assessment</b>	
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	

<b>Student's reasons for appeal</b>			
Please summarise below the reasons for your appeal			
<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

<b>Assessor's comments</b>			
Assessor should present a brief response / comment on the student's stated reasons for appeal			
<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

<b>Internal verifier's comments and decision</b>			
IV should briefly comment on the student's appeal and record their decision			
<b>Date appeal received</b>		<b>Date of reply</b>	
<b>IV signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

<b>Appeal panel's comments and decision</b>			
Chair of appeal panel should briefly comment on the student's appeal and record the panel's decision			
<b>Date appeal received</b>		<b>Date of reply</b>	
<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	



**Receipt of Student Portfolio, Assignment or Work**

Curriculum Area	
Course	
Student Name	
Unit Number and Title	

**Student Declaration**

I confirm that I have received this assessed work back that I accept the grade and I acknowledge responsibility for its safe keeping.

Student signature	
Date	

## Resubmission of Evidence

### When can a Lead Internal Verifier authorise a resubmission?

The Lead Internal Verifier can only authorise a resubmission if all the following conditions are met:

- The student has met initial deadlines set in the assignment or has met an agreed deadline extension.
- The student has correctly authenticated the evidence.
- The Assessor judges that the student will be able to produce improved evidence without further guidance.
- The Assessor has authenticated the evidence submitted for assessment.

### What if a student does not meet all of the conditions?

If a student has not met these conditions, the Lead Internal Verifier must **not** authorise a resubmission.

### Procedure for Resubmission of Evidence

If the Lead Internal Verifier does authorise a resubmission, there is a clear, simple procedure which will be applied consistently across all students and centres.

### Forms and Deadlines

If the Lead Internal Verifier does authorise a resubmission, it must:

- Be recorded on the assessment record.
- State a deadline for resubmission within 15 working days\* of the student receiving\*\* the results of the assessment.
- Be undertaken by the student with no further guidance.

\*15 working days must be within term time, in the same academic year as the original submission and must not fall over a holiday period if students are studying part time, this is the equivalent of 15 days of 'study time' to ensure all students are treated fairly.

\*\*Feedback must be received by students close to the assessment date. It is not permissible for Assessors to retain the feedback until the following term for example, just before a resubmission week or at the end of the year once a student's overall achievement for the qualification is known.

### **Opportunities for Resubmission of Evidence**

Because every assignment contributes towards the final qualification grade, students may be eligible for one resubmission of evidence for each assignment submitted. Your Lead Internal Verifier can authorise a resubmission which ensures any resubmissions are fairly and consistently implemented for all students.

### **When can a Lead Internal Verifier authorise a resubmission?**

The Lead Internal Verifier can only authorise a resubmission if all the following conditions are met:

- The student has met initial deadlines set in the assignment or has met an agreed deadline extension.
- The student has correctly authenticated the evidence.
- The Assessor judges that the student will be able to produce improved evidence without further guidance.
- The Assessor has authenticated the evidence submitted for assessment.

### **What if a student does not meet all of the conditions?**

If a student has not met these conditions, the Lead Internal Verifier must **not** authorise a resubmission.

## Policy for the Use of ChatGPT and AI Chatbots

### Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines for the appropriate use of ChatGPT and AI chatbots to enhance student learning and academic performance.

### Definition

ChatGPT and AI chatbots are AI language models that can assist students in expanding their knowledge, improving their academic performance, and enhancing their writing skills.

### Eligibility

ChatGPT and AI chatbots can be used by college students and staff members in the college for educational purposes as a research tool.

### Guidelines

- ChatGPT and AI chatbots can be used to ask questions and gain insight on relevant topics related to any academic courses. Research
- ChatGPT and AI chatbots should not be used to complete assignments or coursework on behalf of the student or used in replacement
- ChatGPT and AI chatbots should not be used to cheat, plagiarise, or engage in any form of academic misconduct.
- Students and staff members should use their own judgment when relying on ChatGPT and AI chatbots, as they are AI language models and not a substitute for professional advice or human interaction.
- Students and staff members should cite/reference any information obtained from ChatGPT and AI chatbots appropriately in their work.

Like all research tools, thought should always be given to the integrity of the information and should be evaluated by the learner as to the robustness and validity of it; used in conjunction with other sources.

**Support**

The college will provide support and resources for students and staff members to use ChatGPT and AI chatbots appropriately and effectively in their learning and teaching. This includes providing guidance on how to use ChatGPT and AI chatbots, as well as promoting academic integrity and proper citation practices.

**Review:**

This policy will be reviewed periodically to ensure that it remains up-to-date and relevant to the needs of students and staff members using ChatGPT and AI chatbots in the college.

Please refer to the JCQ guidelines for further support in relation to this policy:

[JCG: AI Use in Assessments - Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications](#)

## CPD for Staff

Chichester College Group recognises the value of continuous professional development of staff skills and knowledge to impact on high standards of assessment. Therefore, Chichester College Group interests in the training and development of all staff from the first day of employment.

Staff are all given a thorough Induction to support the Internal Quality Assurance processes. Chichester College Group also ensures that all staff have appropriate level of qualifications and experience to carry out their roles with our quality standards.

Training and Development is continuous throughout the year. Staff undertake standardisation sessions and are provided opportunities for further development on an ongoing basis.

The appraisal process is rigorous and identifies any gaps where staff can be supported to develop and reflect.

The Malpractice and Maladministration Policy is updated and communicated to all staff. Further training and development is carried out with the teams so they can effectively communicate all Assessment Policies to the students and apprentices.

## Sharing the Assessment Policy

Sharing of the Assessment Policy is done at the beginning of the academic year with all the Curriculum Teams.

It is also freely available for all students/apprentices to access from the College Intranet. Staff are vigilant in making sure students and apprentices are directed to the necessary policies relevant to their needs.