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1. **Objectives:**

The objective of this document is to establish an Internal Verification Policy (IVP) at Al Hussein Technical University (HTU).

1. **Scope**

This guidance is applicable to UK and International Centres offering Higher nationals

The document covers the internal verification policy for all Pearson-based programs at HTU; which includes levels 4, 5 of Higher National Education. **( RQF)** The policy applies to documents and forms that are related to assessment briefs and verification of assessment decisions. Majority of the content of this document was taken from Pearson’s BTEC Centre Guide to Internal Verification 2017/18 **(**[**www.btec.co.uk/keydocuments**](http://www.btec.co.uk/keydocuments)).

[**https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Quality%20Assurance/BTEC-Centre-Guide-to-Assessment-L4-7.pdf**](https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Quality%20Assurance/BTEC-Centre-Guide-to-Assessment-L4-7.pdf)

**https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/BTEC-Higher-Nationals/hnqa/HN-Centre-Guide-Quality-Assurance-Assessment-2020-21.pdf**

1. **Introduction**

The intent of the policy is to provide rigor around HTU IVP and in-support of HTU Quality Assurance (QA) program. In order to ensure that assignment briefs meet the learning outcomes (LO) of Pearson specifications, personnel from HTU must verify each assignment briefs before assignments can be given to the students.

1. **Internal verification of Assignment Briefs**

**The Internal Verifier (IV)** should check that the assignment brief:

• has accurate unit and program details

• has clear deadlines for assessment

• shows all relevant assessment criteria for the unit(s) covered in the assignment

• clearly states what evidence the learner needs to provide

• is likely to generate evidence which is appropriate and sufficient

• is set at the appropriate level

• has a time period of appropriate duration

• uses suitable vocational language

• has a clear presentation format.

If you plan to re-use an assignment from the previous academic year, you should check that dates and deadlines are updated and that the assignment is appropriate for the new group of learners. Assignments should be reviewed regularly to ensure they are still fit for purpose and to make improvements based on previous experience of delivering and assessing them.

***Giving feedback to the Assessor***

Internal Verifiers should use the feedback section on the Internal Verification form to provide advice and guidance to the Assessor. If an action is identified by the Internal Verifier, the Assessor should complete the action and return it to the Internal Verifier for sign off prior to an Assignment being issued to learners. Internal Verifiers should provide feedback that makes any actions clear, using Specific, Measureable, Attainable, Reasonable and Time-bound (SMART) principles. Good practice should be commented on.

***Timing***

Assignment briefs have to be internally verified, with any issues addressed, before being distributed to learners.

***Assignments from other sources***

* + There may be occasions where assignments may be used which have come either from published material or from other centers. These assignments still need to be internally verified to ensure that they match the required specifications, that the assignments are appropriate for HTU learners and that you have the resources to deliver them.
	+ An Internal Verifier must ensure that: Pearson Authorized Assignment Brief- as Published- meets the specific needs of HTU learners, is current and relevant for HTU learners and the key information including hand out dates and submission deadlines are appropriate.
	+ The internal verification process must be **sufficient and thorough** to ensure the Adapted Pearson Authorized Assignment Briefs suits the needs of HTU learners.
	+ The internal verification process must be **sufficient and thorough** to ensure the HTU own assignment brief is fully fit for purpose.

***Note:*** *Pearson Checking Service: HTU assessor can also submit assignments to an expert at* ***Pearson Assignment Checking Service*** *who will help make sure you have understood and applied the relevant assessment requirements and provide useful feedback.*

1. **Internal verification of assessment decisions**

**Resources needed:**

• the unit specification

• the assignment brief

• assessed learner work and accompanying assessment record

• internal verification of assessment decisions form

***The internal verification sample***

During the course of the Program, sampling from Assessors should cover the

following as a minimum:

• every Assessor

• every unit

• work from every assignment

There is no requirement that all learners must have been internally verified during the lifetime of a Program.

If following a review of the sample there are any assessment concerns, the sample can be re-selected. For example, if the group has been awarded high grades you may choose to increase the number of learners sampled at this grade.

There is no prescribed sample size but a well-constructed sample should consider:

• the full range of assessment decisions made: pass, merit, distinction criteria, and not yet achieved, should all be included in the sample if possible

• the experience of the Assessor: new or inexperienced Assessors should have more work internally verified than an experienced Assessor

• new BTEC Programs: when a unit or Program is first introduced, the sample should be increased

• the size of the group of learners

• known issues with internal verification: these may have been identified Previously

***The internal verification of assessment decisions process***

The Internal Verifier reviews the Assessor’s judgements against the learning aim, unit content, assessment criteria and assessment guidance as published in the qualification specification. It is advisable for them to check:

• the learner work against the assessment criteria and judge whether it has been assessed accurately.

• the assessment criteria. This represents the national standard and all BTEC learners are measured against it

• coverage of the unit content in conjunction with the assessment guidance to see if the Assessor has taken this into account. It is not a requirement of the unit specification that all of the content is assessed. However, the indicative content will need to be covered in a Program of learning in order for learners to be able to meet the standard determined in the assessment and

grading criteria.

• the feedback from Assessor to learner is accurate and linked to the assessment criteria

***Timing***

For internal verification of assessment decisions to take place, learner work must have been formally assessed. Internal verification must take place before learners receive confirmation of their achievement and feedback. If any inaccuracies are identified by the Internal Verifier, these can be corrected by the Assessor before results are made known to learners. When issues are identified by the Internal Verifier, if appropriate, these should be applied across the group.

***Internally verifying resubmissions***

If a request for a resubmission is made and providing there have been no issues with the Assessor’s decisions at the first submission stage, then the resubmission does not need to be internally verified.

Completing best practice internal verification at the first submission stage should avoid issues around resubmission.

# **Best practices:**

This section details best practices for all documents for the programmes in the school of technology. According to HTU’s delivery model the instructor is the assessor (this includes both lab and course instructors). All documents should be readily uploaded to the digital filing system (DFS) in a timely manner.

* **Specification:**
	+ Instructor must use the recent specification to guide their planning and assessment writing;
	+ Instructor is encouraged to double check with colleagues to make sure that they are using the most recent specification;
	+ The course specific pages from the specification can be shared with students;
	+ Heads of department are encouraged to distribute the specification to their faculty members at the beginning of each semester;
		- Accompanying theme must be checked and sent to make sure that it is being followed by the units that need it.
* **Assessment plan (AP):**
	+ Present in the QA documents folder for the corresponding term;
	+ The assignment plan must be standardised and one for all instructors in a unit;
	+ Signed by Instructor(s);
	+ Signed by LIV or dean;
	+ Shared with students;
	+ Assessments must not assess learning outcomes more than once.
		- *‘Summative assessment’* in the AP document refers to the time that the instructor grades the student work, ***not*** when the instructor releases the grades to students.
		- In order to easily fill the AP document, move chronologically forward from left to right (Hand-out date → hand-in date → summative assessment date → IV sampling date).
* **Scheme of work (SoW):**
	+ Present in the QA documents folder for the corresponding term;
	+ Covers topics to be assessed mainly (mandatory);
	+ Includes topics that may be relevant but are not assessed (optional);
	+ Shared with students
* **Assignment brief:**
	+ Present in the QA documents folder (in the specified IV documents folder) for the corresponding term;
	+ Hand-out / sending date is close to the date specified in the assessment plan;
	+ Hand-in / receiving date is close to the date specified in the assessment plan;
	+ Hand-in / receiving date can be held during the period specified in the academic calendar as ‘summative assessment period’;
	+ If the instructor(s) chooses to extend the hand-in date for students, then an email sent to students via outlook or through the announcements function on the elearning platform must be attached separately in the QA documents;
	+ If there needs to be a deadline extension, then it must be done after ***consensus*** by instructors to ensure fairness to all students in multiple sections;
	+ Assignment briefs ***must not*** be issued to students if they have not been internally verified by the IV;
	+ Assignment briefs must be fit for purpose;
	+ A range of assessment methods may be exercised as long as they are uniform and allow students to produce relevant output;
	+ Instructors should not use quizzes as forms of summative or formative assessment as they do not reflect the student’s ability to perform required skills, practice actions according to the assessment criteria and do not reflect vocational contexts;
	+ Instructors must not use multiple choice or fill in the blanks questions;
	+ Assignments should be written to reflect vocational contexts and can be applied to a variety of workplaces and industries;
	+ Assignments should be written in appropriate language;
	+ Instructors should reference assessment criteria action verbs (command or descriptive verbs) in their briefs;
	+ Instructors should not make direct numerical references to assessment criteria in their briefs;
	+ Text stylisation can be used to aid readability:
		- Black and bold for paraphrased assessment criteria action verbs and requirements;
		- Light blue, italic and underlined for specific tools and methods;
		- Light orange for designated roles;
	+ The smallest possible summative assessment must cover a whole learning outcome. **Summative assessments must not assess individual criterion**;
	+ In cases of single stage assignments:
		- The assignment brief covers all learning outcomes and is issued once;
		- The student has the right to improve on their already handed in work without the need to redo the whole assignment unless their performance was very poor;
		- Formative feedback should highlight strengths and weaknesses;
		- Single stage assignments are ideal for project-based learning;
	+ In units where an annual theme is used, assessment briefs should match this and make it explicit to students.
	+ Procedures for summative assessment:
		- If there are multiple instructors for a unit, summative assessment decisions should be standardised between all of them - this can be implemented using instructors’ guides or key solutions.
* **Internal verification for assignment brief (IV for AB):**
	+ Present QA documents folder (in the specified IV documents folder) for the corresponding term;
	+ Approval date before the issue date for the assignment;
	+ Internal Verifiers should provide instructors with constructive and developmental feedback;
	+ Signed by instructor(s);
	+ Signed by the internal verifier (mandatory);
	+ Signed by LIV or dean (optional and if needed);
	+ LIV or dean should preferably only sign if they have looked at the assignment brief;
	+ The instructor / assessor cannot be the IV for the unit;
* **Internal verification for assessment decisions (IV for AD):**
	+ Present QA documents folder (in the specified IV documents folder) for the corresponding term;
	+ Approval date before grade submission date (refer to academic calendar);
	+ Any disagreements and required actions about assessment decisions should be resolved before proceeding;
	+ Internal verifiers can sample grades before or after the assessment summative date of an assignment, however, this has to be done and approved before the grades are submitted to the portal and published to students.
	+ In the case of multiple assignments, the IV for AD can be carried out at the end of the course or after each assignment depending on the head of department’s policy;
	+ Signed by the instructor(s);
	+ Signed by the internal verifier;
	+ LIV or dean should preferably only sign if they have looked at the sampled assessment decisions;
* **Student work:**
	+ It is the students’ responsibility to complete the assignment brief’s requirements;
	+ Burden of authenticity bears on the student;
	+ Students should be encouraged to produce authentic work;
	+ Students should be informed of the centre’s policy on plagiarism and potential consequences for such actions;
	+ Student work should be compiled in folders according to student name before uploading them to the portal
		- This should include any assessment(s) and other forms as well;
	+ Declaration forms are signed by the student with the date lining up with the hand-in date specified by the assignment brief;
	+ Students should be informed to attach the declaration form for their work in a separate document to ease verification (internal and external);
	+ The instructor may use a variety of methods to test authenticity (e.g viva, using student ID for numerical questions, etc.);
	+ The instructor should inform students to hand-in their work through the elearning platform with Turnitin enabled to catch plagiarism. Email hand-ins are discouraged as they are time and effort consuming in verification and can detract from time that should be spent grading;
	+ Formative feedback should be documented by email by the instructor;
	+ Formative feedback should not be carried out via Microsoft Teams messages as these can be altered and deleted;
	+ Instructors should report any student malpractice to their superiors;
* **Summative feedback:**
	+ Signed by the instructor;
	+ Contains the name, ID, programme and section of the student;
	+ Signature date can be before or on the day of the submission of the final grades but after the internal verification of the assessment decision dates;
	+ Signed by the student in a timely manner - students should be given 48 hours to sign them
	+ Reference to assessment criteria should be given in the summative feedback;
	+ Strengths and weaknesses should be highlighted;
	+ In the case of multiple assignments, students should receive their feedback for one assignment before embarking on the next one;
	+ Assessment decisions have been accurately communicated to the student - use of spreadsheet logs is encouraged to keep track of decisions;
	+ A grid for assessment criteria should be used at the end to summarise student performance;
	+ Mail merging may be used to expedite the process;
* **Resubmissions:**
	+ Students must fulfill all of the following conditions to be eligible for resubmissions:
		- The student has met the initial deadlines set in the assignment, has met an agreed deadline extension, or has submitted work late that has been accepted;
		- The assessor judges that the student has fully attempted to achieve all targeted learning outcomes in their original submission;
		- The assessor judges that the student will be able to provide improved evidence without further guidance;
		- The student work is authentic;
	+ Failure to fulfill any of the conditions may lead to a rejection in a student’s resubmission request at the assessors’ discretion;
	+ Students that are eligible for resubmission should apply for a resubmission during the specified time period allocated in the academic calendar; ( the process is fully automated on the student portal; annexed Nov 2022
	+ Resubmissions must only cover the missing pass criteria the student missed from their original submission;
		- Assessors are not allowed under any circumstance to reassess merit or distinction criteria;
	+ Assessors should complete grading within the specified time period;
	+ Assessors should adjust the summative assessment feedback to reflect resubmission grades with the correct dates filled in;
* **Grade appeals:**
	+ Students should apply for grade appeals within the allocated time period as per the academic period;
	+ The student must provide written evidence for the appeal;
	+ Students should pay the required fee;
	+ A committee should be formed;
	+ The original instructor should be informed that a grade appeal has been filed;
	+ The committee should discuss with the instructor the reasons why the student was given the original grade;
	+ If the committee finds that a change in the grade is appropriate then this should be recorded with reasons;
	+ Decisions for change of grade must be approved by the Dean’s Council;
* The appeal process is fully automated and available on the student portal. The work – flow has been approved by the Dean’s Council and is validated across all schools at HTU (annexed Nov 2022)

#