

WHITECHAPEL COLLEGE
INTERNAL VERIFICATION POLICY

4th March 2014

What follows is the general policy that Whitechapel College adopts in terms of internal verification processes.

The relevant Head of Department (HoD) determines which academic staff are to undertake the internal assessment of student assignments (Assessors). In allocating such work the relevant HoD will take into account the subject expertise and experience of colleagues. Normally the class teacher will have a major role and involvement as Assessor in this assessment process. Each Assessor is individually responsible for ensuring that assignments are marked and returned to students as soon as possible and within a reasonable time from receipt and to convey to the students helpful and legible written comments. The HoD will have a supportive supervisory role in this regard.

The HoD will also be responsible for the appointment of Internal Verifiers (IVs) as the next stage of the internal verification process. The IVs should themselves not have been involved directly in the first-stage assessment process.

IVs will be selected for their subject expertise and substantial experience in assessing student assignments at the requisite levels. For example, a HoD may be considered to be a suitable IV. The IVs will randomly select for each learners unit the scripts to be verified but they must ensure that they sample 15% - 25% of the total assignments submitted. Internal Verifiers should pay particular regard to borderline cases eg those, crucially, on the pass/fail border and those on class borders between, for example, pass/merit and merit/distinction and cases where IVs substantially disagree on the assessment category awarded.

ALL scripts can, of course, be scrutinised by External Verifiers (EVs) but it will be the responsibility of the relevant HoD to select the sample scripts when such are required by an EV.

Whitechapel College will do all possible to provide at induction and on an ongoing basis suitable staff development opportunities for Assessors and IVs eg by organising workshops where such as marking standards and feedback requirements are discussed and agreed. Such workshops will be led by a member of the College's Leadership Team (LT) supported by HoDs. External facilitators will be invited to lead such in-house workshops where they have a particular expertise that can benefit colleagues. Attendance at these workshops will be recorded in the file of individual staff members and reviewed as part of the annual staff appraisal system.

The Chief Executive Officer will be responsible for any matters of remuneration for Assessors, IVs and external facilitators.

Some awarding bodies, of course, have specific quality processes and Whitechapel College is only too happy to incorporate these processes to complement its general policy which is stated above. Where there is any conflict between Whitechapel College's general policy and the specific policy of an awarding body Whitechapel College will follow to the latter the specific policy of the awarding body.

Some awarding bodies are quite specific in its requirements for Internal Quality Assurer (ie Internal Verifier or IV) sampling of centre (ie college) activity.

With regard to sampling, all models of internal quality assurance sampling plans must ensure that over time all Assessors, all assessment methods and all learners units are included in the sample.

Whitechapel College operates a four-stage appeals procedure as follows:

STAGE 1: if a student is not satisfied with the mark allocated in an assessment they should make an appointment to meet the Assessor to discuss and, hopefully, resolve the matter. Such a meeting should be sought by the student within one week of their receipt of the mark. Such a meeting should normally take place within one week of the student communicating to the Assessor their desire for such a meeting. The Assessor should inform the student in writing as soon as possible (but normally within one week of the meeting) of the decision reached.

The Assessor should make an entry in the student's file summarising the Stage 1 meeting and its outcome.

STAGE 2: if a student is not satisfied with the outcome of the Stage 1 meeting they should then make an appointment to meet the relevant HoD to discuss and, hopefully resolve the matter. This meeting should be sought by the student within one week of the previous Stage 1 meeting with the Assessor. The Stage 2 meeting with the HoD should normally take place within one week of the student communicating to the HoD their desire for such a meeting. The HoD should inform the student in writing as soon as possible (but normally within one week of the meeting) of the decision reached. The HoD should make an entry in the student's file (which should already contain a summary of the Stage 1 meeting) summarising the Stage 2 meeting and its outcome.

STAGE 3: if a student is not satisfied with the outcome of the Stage 2 meeting they should make an appointment to meet the Academic Director to discuss and, hopefully resolve the matter. This meeting should be sought by the student within one week of the previous Stage 2 meeting with the HoD. The Stage 3 meeting with the Academic Director should normally take place within one week of the student communicating to the Academic Director their desire for such a meeting. The Academic Director should inform the student in writing as soon as possible (but normally within one week of the meeting) of the decision reached. The Academic Director should make an entry in the student's file (which should already contain a summary of the Stage 1 and of the Stage 2 meetings) summarising the Stage 3 meeting and its outcome.

STAGE 4: if a student is not satisfied with the outcome of the Stage 3 meeting they should inform the President in writing that they wish to present their case before the Academic Appeals Panel (AAP). This meeting of the AAP should be sought by the student within one week of the previous Stage 3 meeting with the Academic Director. The AAP will consist of the President (as chair), the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and a member of academic staff selected by the CEO and President. The Stage 4 meeting of the AAP should normally take place within one week of the student communicating to the President their desire for such a (final)

meeting. The President should inform the student in writing as soon as possible (but normally within one week of the meeting) of the decision reached. The President should make an entry in the student's file (which should already contain a summary of the Stage 1, 2 and 3 meetings) summarising the Stage 4 meeting and its outcome.

Some awarding bodies, of course, have specific appeals procedures and Whitechapel College is, once again, only too happy to incorporate those procedures to complement the general policy which is stated above. Where there is any conflict between Whitechapel College's general policy and the specific policy of an awarding body, Whitechapel College will follow to the latter the specific policy of the awarding body.

If a learner wishes to complain, the complaint is lodged with the centre co-ordinator (Anwar Hussain as CEO), within twenty (20) working days of the issue arising. The centre co-ordinator sets a date for the complaint to be considered by the complaints panel. He attempts to find a solution with the individuals concern. And he notifies the Consultant that a complaint has been lodged and gives details of how it will be heard, including the composition of the complaints panel.

The complaints panel then meets to consider the complaint within twenty (20) working days of the centre co-ordinator receiving the complaint.

The panel will ensure that it has full accounts from all parties involved in the assessment. No one involved in the original assessment will be on the panel.