Applied General Centre Handbook

Version 24-25

Level 3

2024-2025

This policy applies to post-16 NCLT colleges only.

CONTENTS

1.0 Aims and Objectives

1.1 Aims

New Collaborative Learning Trust (NCLT) is committed to ensuring that standards of assessment are consistent, transparent and in line with the requirements of our awarding bodies. The way students' work is assessed must serve the stated learning objectives of the programmes we offer and facilitate the achievement and wider development of our students.

1.2 Objectives

1.2.1 To assess students' work with integrity by being consistent and transparent in our assessment judgements and processes so that the outcomes are fair, reliable and valid.

1.2.2 To ensure that assessment standards and specifications are implemented fully (both in spirit and in letter), so that no risk is posed to the reputation of the awarding bodies or the qualifications we offer.

1.2.3 To establish quality control and recording mechanisms for assignments and their assessment through a system of sampling, moderation, internal verification and cross-departmental co-ordination as appropriate to the requirements of the programmes we offer.

1.2.4 To provide student-centred approaches to assessment, which provide opportunities for students to achieve at levels commensurate with the demands of their course.

1.3 Our Mission

To provide dynamic, high quality learning experiences in a supportive, young adult environment, enabling academic success and personal growth.

1.4 Our Vision

Our vision is to make a significant difference to the lives of young people. As a result, together we will make a positive contribution to social mobility.

2.0 Assessment Policy and Procedures

2.1 Aims

Internal Assessment is defined as the process where staff make judgements on evidence produced by students against required criteria for the qualification. All college devised assessment materials must be internally verified before being issued to students.

2.1.1 Completed student assignments will be assessed internally, be subject to internal verification and external moderation by the awarding body if and when required.

2.1.2 Students must be left in no doubt that any grade awarded will be subject to internal and/or external scrutiny (moderation) and that ultimately the final decision rests with the awarding body.

2.1.3 The Assessor is responsible for ensuring that assessment processes are consistent and transparent, that evidence is valid, sufficient, and authentic, and that judgement of evidence is valid and reliable.

- Feedback: Once the learner begins work for the assessment, the assessor must not provide specific assessment feedback on the evidence produced by the student before it is submitted for assessment or confirm achievement of specific assessment criteria until the assessment stage.

- Submission of evidence: The Assessor must formally record and confirm the achievement of specific assessment criteria, complete a confirmation that the evidence they have assessed is authentic and is the learner's own work. The Assessor must not provide feedback or guidance on how to improve the evidence to achieve higher grades.

2.1.4 Students: Each student must submit an assignment for assessment which consists of evidence towards the targeted assessment criteria, a signed and dated declaration of authenticity with each assignment which confirms they have produced the evidence themselves. It is acceptable for students to submit work via Teams, their individual log in will act as student signature.

2.1.5 Students: Must work independently on their assignment to produce and prepare evidence for assessment before the final submission deadline. For BTEC qualifications one submission of evidence for assessment is allowed. One opportunity to resubmit evidence if the learner has met all the necessary conditions and the resubmission is authorised by the Lead Internal Verifier is allowed. One opportunity for a retake (new assignment) for BTEC Nationals on the Qualifications on the RQF framework. This must be authorised by the Lead Internal Verifier and this can only be to pass level.

2.1.6 Lead Internal Verifier: Because every assignment contributes to the final qualification grade, it may be appropriate for the Lead Internal Verifier to authorise one opportunity for a learner to resubmit evidence to meet assessment criteria targeted by an assignment.

2.2 Requesting an extension to a deadline and requests for reasonable adjustments

2.2.1 A student may submit a request for an extension to a deadline, this request will be approved or declined using the JCQ document entitled 'A guide to the special consideration process 2024/25 – General and Vocational qualifications' available at https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance/

2.2.2 The process is outlined below

- Student speaks to teacher to request an extension, providing the reason
- Teacher and LIV have conversation regarding the student/assignment and the reason for the request

- LIV will determine if the reason for the extension will meet the JCQ criteria
- Where LIV does not believe that the reason given by the student will meet the JCQ criteria, the student is informed and this is recorded on student Pastoral Log on Cedar.
- If the reason meets the criteria the student will be provided with the electronic form by teacher/LIV to complete the online extension form which notifies QN
- LIV and QN meet to discuss reasons for request, check any evidence and approve or decline the request.
- Student informed of decision by LIV / teacher, with record of decision logged on student Pastoral Log on Cedar.

2.2.3 Reasonable adjustment requests in Applied General Qualifications

Where students are eligible for reasonable adjustments, these are already applied as part of the student's normal way of working. Examples of reasonable adjustments can be found in JCQ document entitled 'Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2024/25' available at https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance/

The relevant adjustments that apply to a learner are listed on the learner's 'Study Support Summary' page on Cedar. Teaching staff must ensure that the deadlines set for internal assessments are planned to provide sufficient time for all learners to complete the work to the required standard.

Should it be requested by the awarding body, each college should present the VQ/IA form detailing the reasonable adjustments that are applied to internally assessed units. The reasonable adjustments that should be detailed are those that are listed on the learner's 'Study Support Summary' page on Cedar that are relevant to internally assessed units. The JCQ VQ/IA form can be found at https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/forms/. Pearson BTEC have their own version of the form, entitled an RA1 form, which can be found at https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/exams/special-requirements/reasonable-adjustment.html.

The arrangements outlined here for requesting extensions and reasonable adjustments also apply to deadlines set for resubmissions (section 2.3) and retakes (section 2.4)

Where a student believes that they are eligible for reasonable adjustments to be made, or where their 'Study Support Summary' page on their Cedar profile does not accurately reflect the reasonable adjustments that they believe should be in place, they should discuss with a member of the Study Support team or the SENDCO in the first instance.

2.3 Resubmission

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

- The student has met initial deadlines set in the assignment or has met an agreed deadline extension.

- The assessor judges that the student will be able to provide improved evidence without further guidance, other than the feedback that awarding body guidance

deems appropriate.

- The Assessor has authenticated the evidence submitted for assessment and the evidence is accompanied by a signed and dated declaration of authenticity by the learner.

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

2.3.3 The deadline for resubmissions will be 10-working days from the date that feedback was provided. Students who miss this deadline will then be given an additional 5-working days in which to submit the assignment.

2.4 Retakes

2.4.1 Conditions for retaking a new assignment: If a student has met all of the conditions listed above in opportunities for resubmission, but still not achieved the targeted pass criteria following resubmission of an assignment, the Lead Internal Verifier may authorise one retake opportunity to meet the required pass criteria. The Lead Internal Verifier must only authorise a retake in exceptional circumstances where they believe it is necessary, appropriate and fair to do so.

- The retake must be a new task or assignment targeted only to the pass criteria which were not achieved in the original assignment.
- The Assessor cannot award a merit or distinction grade for a retake.
- The Assessor must agree and record a clear deadline before the learner starts a retake.
- The student and the Assessor must sign declarations of authentication as they both did for the previous submissions.
- The student will not be allowed any further resubmissions or retakes.
- Standards Verifiers will require LIVs to include evidence of any retakes in sampling.

2.5 Role of the Assessor

2.5.1 The role of the Assessor is to:

- Set tasks which allow students to demonstrate what they know, understand and can do, so that they have the opportunity to achieve the highest possible grades on their courses.
- Ensure that students are clear about the criteria they are expected to meet in their assignments and that they are fully briefed on the skills which need to be demonstrated in the coursework/portfolio components of a subject.
- Set deadlines for coursework in accordance with the assessment plan and advise students on the appropriate amount of time to spend on the work, ensuring it is commensurate with the credit available.
- Aim to mark and return work within two weeks of submission.
- Adhere to the Awarding Body's specification in the assessment of student assignments.
- Store student work securely for 12 weeks after the point of certification of the largest qualification.

- Store Assessment records securely for 3 years after certification.
- Log any missed deadlines using the 'Recorded Warning' thread on the student's Pastoral Log on Cedar.
- Action the Formal Intervention system following repeated missed deadlines or punctuality/attendance issues.
- Ensure each student signs to confirm that the work is their own and that it is endorsed by the teacher after marking the work. A completed original document must be securely attached to the work of each candidate and to that of each sample request.
- Provide accurate records of internally assessed coursework marks to the Exams Office in a timely manner for transfer to the awarding body.
- Record assessment data on Cedar.
- Make use of TAP sessions for students who may require extra support.
- Prepare students for external assessments including examined units, controlled assessments and set tasks in line with the NCLT teaching and learning policy.

3.0 Internal (Cedar) Assessments in AGQ in 2024-25

- At all assessment points, Applied General subjects will enter a 'current grade' at every assessment point. This grade will be generated by a subject specific calculator, the grade will take into account all units completed to date.
- If Applied General subjects are due to sit an external assessment (in Jan or Summer) it is an expectation that a mock assessment is completed for the assessment point prior to the timing of the external assessment (i.e. DC 2 and/or DC 4) and the grade achieved on this assessment will be entered into the calculator to form part of the 'current grade'.
- 2024-25 assessment calendar is included as an appendix.

4.0 Internal Verification Policy and Procedures

4.1 Aims

4.1.1 The Lead Internal Verifier is at the heart of quality assurance. The role is to ensure that internally assessed work consistently meets national standards but can also lead to staff development and quality improvement.

4.1.2 Each Principal Subject Area will have an identified Lead Internal Verifier (LIV) who is not otherwise involved in the assessing or setting of work which he or she is asked to verify.

4.1.3 The Lead Internal Verifier will set up and maintain an internal verification schedule (assessment plan) at the beginning of each year setting out when internal verification will take place and by whom making sure all assessors are covered for each unit. This will be stored electronically on OneDrive and/or Sharepoint, as directed by the Quality Nominee for each institution.

4.1.4 Provision will be made for communication between course teams to share 'best practice' and areas of concern. Typically, this will be achieved through regular meetings at which standards and processes are discussed to maximise consistency

between courses and across colleges.

4.2 The Role of the Internal Verifier

4.2.1 The internal verifier should:

- Not verify their own work or assignments.
- Ensure that all assignment briefs are verified as fit for purpose prior to their being circulated to students. They should enable students to meet the unit grading criteria.
- Make recommendations to the Assessor on how to improve the quality of the brief if necessary.
- Make all IV evidence available to the SV as necessary.
- Plan with the course team an annual internal verification schedule linked to assignment plans.
- Plan with the course team an assessment plan for each qualification.
- Consider the assessment decisions of all units and all assessors to judge whether the Assessor has assessed accurately against the unit grading criteria.
- Verify samples of work – 3 pieces of work per unit per assessor covering all awarded grades (Pass, Merit, Distinction and Fail if possible) ensuring all assessors are scrutinised throughout the duration of the course (experienced staff). Where teachers teach more than 100 students per unit across numerous classes the sample size must be increased to 8. New or inexperienced assessors must have 5 pieces internally verified per unit, new assessors to NCLT must have 5 pieces per unit internally verified and staff members under scrutiny 6 pieces per unit internally verified until the LIV is satisfied with the assessment grading. These numbers can change throughout the year at the discretion of the LIV, the QN (Quality Nominee) should be kept updated.
- Consider alternative methods of moderation/verification as required for non-written assessments (eg, assessments of performance, oral presentations, and work placements). In most cases, the documentary record of the assessor(s) will provide the basis for verification.
- Maintain secure records of all work sampled as part of their verification process.
- If a concern is raised the IV should discuss this with the Assessor prior to the final confirmation of the marks for all the students taking the assignment. As a result of the IV process it may be necessary for the Assessor(s) to reconsider the marks awarded for the entire cohort of students and, as a consequence, to make changes either to all marks or to some marks.
- Where re-sampling is necessary the work should be verified again before being sent to the SV and records kept.

5.0 Assessment Malpractice Policy and Procedures

5.1 Aims

5.1.1 Authentication of Candidate's Work

- 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

candidate concerned and was conducted under required conditions. This should be done on the feedback sheet once a portfolio is complete.

- Students should submit assignments on Microsoft Teams, attaching work as files that have been uploaded to the assignment, rather than hyperlinks to documents that the student has shared from their OneDrive or similar. The Microsoft Teams assignment wording should include the learner authentication statement provided by the relevant awarding body, and students should be reminded that they agree to this statement when they submit their work.

- If the student submits an assignment and teachers suspect it is not the student's own work, the matter should be investigated, and the Quality Nominee should be involved. The student should be informed of the outcome as soon as possible.

5.2 Student Misconduct

Misconduct covers a range of offences, which can be collectively described as cheating. The following is not an exhaustive list and the Trust reserves the right to include any other type of cheating under the terms of this policy.

- Plagiarism: taking someone else's work, images or ideas, whether published or not, and with or without their permission, and passing them off as your own: thereby not properly acknowledging the original source. This particularly relates to material downloaded from the Internet or copied from books.
- Copying the work of other students with or without their permission and knowingly, allowing another student to copy one's own work.
- Colluding with other students to produce work, which is then submitted individually, except where this is specifically required/allowed by the assessment criteria.
- Falsely claiming extenuating circumstances to gain an unfair advantage in assessment outcomes.
- Submitting work done by another student as your own.
- Misuse of Artificial Intelligence (AI). This is outlined ~~as~~ further below.

5.3 Artificial Intelligence

5.3.1 Defining Artificial Intelligence

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications. While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments is considered malpractice by awarding bodies, and a serious breach of the student code of conduct.

Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are still being developed and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in the data sets (large

language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate.

AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

- Answering questions
- Analysing, improving, and summarising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
- Writing computer code
- Translating text from one language to another
- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or formality

Some AI chatbots currently available include:

- ChatGPT (https://chat.openai.com)
- Jenni AI (https://jenni.ai)
- Jasper AI (https://www.jasper.ai/)
- Writesonic (https://writesonic.com/chat/)
- Bloomai (https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom)
- Google Bard

There are also some AI tools which can be used to generate images, such as:

- Midjourney (https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/)
- Stable Diffusion (https://stablediffusionweb.com/)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (https://openai.com/dall-e-2/)

5.3.2 AI Misuse

Any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice. While AI may become an established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it's important for students' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Students should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

5.3.3 Referencing AI

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example:

ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/ blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2023.

The student must also retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a noneditable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

This must be submitted with the assignment so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to discuss with the Quality Nominee to determine the appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own.

5.3.4 Ways to prevent misuse

While there may be benefits to using AI in some situations, there is the potential for it to be misused by students, either accidentally or intentionally. AI misuse, in that it involves a student submitting work for qualification assessments which is not their own, will be considered a form of plagiarism. Teachers must be assured that the work they accept and mark for assessment can be authenticated as the student's own work.

The activities outlined below should be carried out by teachers/assessors to help prevent AI misuse or identify where AI has been used.

<u>Compulsory activities</u>

- Prior to the start of teaching, all students on applied general courses should be shown the 'Student AGQ Video'. This video includes details of what could be considered misuse of AI and outlines the possible consequences of such activity, including disqualification of the student from the Applied General qualification(s) concerned.
- Within all applied general lessons it is a directive that before any assignments are completed, students should complete an in-class task that is designed to assess students writing ability. The task may be word processed or handwritten but should be completed in class under direct supervision so that the teacher is able to establish the writing ability of each student at the start of the course. The teacher should retain the task for the duration of the course.
- Review current assignment briefs and where it is decided that AI may be likely to be misused, consider changing the format of the assessment methods from essay style assessment to task such as PowerPoint presentations, video submissions, group presentations, group discussions etc.
- Teachers should not accept, without further investigation, work which is suspected to have been taken from AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised – doing so encourages the spread of this practice and is likely to constitute staff malpractice which can attract sanctions.

<u>Suggested activities</u>

- Where appropriate throughout the course, teachers should allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence.
- Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages.
- Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material.
- Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work
- Request that students use and reference the textbook associated with the course or specific websites / books / journals that you signpost.
- Consider where appropriate the inclusion of graphs/data tables/visual aids in assignment criteria, as in most cases AI cannot generate these.

5.3.5 Identifying misuse of AI

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers already use to assure themselves student work is authentically their own.

These include comparison of the learner work with previous work, being aware of potential indicators of AI use, and the use of automated detection tools.

Comparison with previous work

When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Where the work is made up of writing, one can make note of the following characteristics:

- Spelling and punctuation
- Grammatical usage
- Writing style and tone
- Vocabulary
- Complexity and coherency
- General understanding and working level
- The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)

Where misuse of AI is suspected teachers should compare newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

Awareness of potential indicators of AI use, such as:

a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations
b) A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level
c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected

d) Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
e) Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
f) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
g) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
h) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
i) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
j) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themself, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
k) The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
l) The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
m) The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth, variety or to overcome its output limit
n) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
o) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style

Automated detection tools

AI chatbots, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means that AI-generated content uses the most common combinations of words, unlike humans who use a variety of words in their normal writing.

Several programs and services use this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI:

- OpenAI Classifier (https://openai.com/blog/new-ai-classifier-for-indicating-aiwritten-text/)
- GPTZero (https://gptzero.me/)
- The Giant Language Model Test Room (GLTR) (http://gltr.io/dist/)

5.4 Preventing Generic Student Misconduct (not specific to AI misuse)

5.4.1 The Trust will take positive steps to prevent and reduce the occurrence of malpractice by students. These will include:

- Using the induction period to inform students of the policy on malpractice and consequent penalties of plagiarism and misuse of AI via the Student AGQ video, as discussed in section 5.3.4.
- Showing students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources including websites. Students should not be

discouraged from conducting research; indeed evidence of relevant research often contributes to the achievement of higher grades. However, the submitted work must show evidence that the student has interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and has acknowledged any sources used.

- Introducing procedures for assessing work in a way that reduces or identifies malpractice, e.g. plagiarism, collusion, cheating, etc. These procedures may include:

    - ⇨ The requirement for interim work to be handed in before final deadlines to give a picture of the student's progress.
    - ⇨ Periods of supervised sessions during which evidence for assignments/tasks/coursework is produced by the student.
    - ⇨ Altering assessment assignments/tasks/tools on a regular basis.
    - ⇨ The assessor assessing work for a single assignment/task in a single session for the complete cohort of students.
    - ⇨ Using oral questions with students to ascertain their understanding of the concepts, application, etc within their work.
    - ⇨ Assessors getting to know their students' styles and abilities.
    - ⇨ Using software to detect malpractice.

- Ensuring access controls are installed to prevent students from accessing and using other people's work when using networked computers.

5.4.2 Student Misconduct Investigations and Actions

There will be an investigation if student misconduct is suspected which may lead to disciplinary action.

- Students who attempt to gain an award by deceitful means will automatically have their result(s) suspended (held) pending investigation by the member of teaching staff and the Quality Nominee. The student will be informed at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences.
- The outcome of the investigation will determine the appropriate course of action to be taken by the College.
- Malpractice is a breach of the student code of conduct and will invoke a formal Behaviour and Conduct action.
- Where students have been found to use high levels of plagiarism this will be considered gross misconduct and would usually be addressed via a Stage 4 or 5 Behaviour and Conduct Action, in line with the policy.
- Cases where low level plagiarism has been identified, such as mistakes with quotations or citations will be dealt with using Stage 1 of the Behaviour and Conduct Action, or a one level of escalation, if the student has already entered the Behaviour and Conduct system.
- Teachers should report all cases of plagiarism, including misuse of AI to the Quality Nominee. The Quality Nominee is responsible for assessing the level of misconduct and the subsequent action.
- Any case where student malpractice is found to be substantiated will be reported to the awarding body.

- If no evidence of student misconduct is found, then the benefit of the doubt should be given to the student and the grade achieved should be awarded.

5.4.3 Staff Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by Trust staff (this list is not exhaustive):

- Alteration of awarding body assessment and grading criteria.
- Assisting students in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves staff producing work for the student.
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated.
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own, to be included in a student's assignment/task/portfolio/ coursework.
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Misusing the conditions for special student requirements.
- Failing to keep student computer/paper files secure.
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.
- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the student completing all the requirements of assessment.
- Not following submission and re-submission guidelines as set out in the Assessment Policy.

Where staff malpractice is suspected, an investigation will take place under staff disciplinary procedures.

6.0 Appeals Policy and Procedures

6.1 Aims

6.1.1 It is the responsibility of the College as an assessment centre, to make all students aware of the appeals procedure and give them access to a copy of the procedure.

6.1.2 The QN is responsible for managing the formal appeals process. If deemed necessary, a formal appeals panel will be set up comprising at least three people, where at least one member is independent of the assessment process.

6.1.3 Written records of all appeals should be maintained by the College. These should include a description of the appeal, the outcome of the appeal and the reason for that outcome. A tracking document will be used to follow the course of an appeal, allowing it to be time tracked and verified at each stage.

6.2 Grounds for Appeal

A student would have grounds for appeal against an assessment decision in the following situations. This list is selective and not exhaustive.

- The work is not assessed according to the set criteria or the criteria are ambiguous.

- The final grade of the work does not match the criteria set for grade boundaries or the grade boundaries are not sufficiently defined.
- The internal verification procedure contradicts the assessment grades awarded.
- There is evidence of preferential treatment towards other students/candidates.
- The conduct of the assessment did not conform to the published requirements of the Awarding Body
- Valid, agreed, extenuating circumstances were not taken into account at the time of assessment, which the College was aware of prior to the submission deadline.
- Agreed deadlines were not observed by staff.
- The current Assessment Plan was not adhered to.
- The decision to reject coursework on the grounds of malpractice.

6.3 Formal Appeal Procedures

6.3.1 If, after informal discussion with the LIV, the candidate wishes to make a formal appeal, the student must complete the electronic Applied General appeals request form, which is shared with students at the start of each academic year and will be resent by the LIV to the candidate following the discussions. This must be done within 10 working days of receiving the original assessment result.

6.3.2 The QN, with the Lead Internal Verifier, on receipt of the formal appeal from the student, will try to seek a solution negotiated between the relevant assessor and the student. If it is not possible to reach an agreement, the QN and the LIV will set a date for the Internal Verification Appeals Panel to meet.

6.3.3 The Internal Verification Appeals Panel will normally meet within 2 weeks of the receipt of the appeal by the LIV, with re-assessment, if deemed necessary by the panel, taking place within 15 working days of the appeals panel meeting.

6.3.4 The outcome of the appeal may be:

- Confirmation of original decision;
- A re-assessment by an independent assessor;
- An opportunity to resubmit for assessment within a revised agreed timescale.

6.3.5 On receipt of the outcome of appeals panel a student still feels they do not agree with the decision they may appeal to Pearson or the relevant awarding body.

7.0 College Complaints Policy and Procedure

NCLT is committed to high quality provision and support and we operate in a climate of fairness, equality and mutual respect. We also believe that we can learn from the experience and views of students, parents and other stakeholders and want to listen and respond to any concerns that you may have. Everyone has a role to play in resolving difficulties and we want to work constructively with students, parents and staff to address any issues that may arise.

7.1 What should you do if you have a query or want to discuss progress?

7.1.1 If you have a query or want to discuss issues such as progress or well-being, please contact the relevant teacher or Progress Tutor.

7.1.2 It is important not to let problems get too big or out of hand. Discussing or reporting a concern quickly will help you and us to find a quick and effective resolution. We will treat promptly, fairly and seriously any concerns from students, parents or other individual or organisation involved with the relevant College. Initially, it is often good to talk to the member of staff most directly involved.

7.1.3 When you raise a concern, you can expect us to listen to the issues you raise, investigate them thoroughly if needed and give you feedback about any steps or actions we feel are appropriate to deal with your concerns.

7.2 Taking the matter further – making things formal

7.2.1 If you feel your concerns are very serious in nature or you feel that earlier actions haven't fully addressed your concerns, please contact the **Complaints Officer**. The member of senior management designated as the Complaints Officer is **Lauren Walker**. She can be contacted via email at lauren.walker@nclt.ac.uk or via telephone on 01977 702139.

7.2.2 The Complaints Officer will review the complaint and determine the most appropriate member of staff to handle the complaint or conduct further investigations, where required. Where complaints are serious, the Principal will be notified. The Complaints Officer will ensure that we provide you with feedback about how long it is likely to take us to deal with your complaint and, where appropriate, any actions taken to address your concerns.

7.2.3 Any action is at the discretion of the Principal and Senior Management based on the nature of the initial complaint and supporting evidence. In the interests of fairness and consistency, all formal complaints will be managed initially by the Complaints Officer. This policy applies to all students regardless of qualification type or age.

7.2.4 Please see the Trust Complaints Policies for full details, including appeals. This can be found on our website or by contacting the relevant College.

8.0 Recognition of Prior Learning Policy and Process

8.1 Scope of Policy

This policy applies to all Applied General qualifications delivered within NCLT. Where the use of RPL is permitted, this will be stated within the qualification specification.

8.2 Policy Statement

8.2.1 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) is a method of assessment [leading to the award of a qualification] that considers whether learners can demonstrate that they can meet the assessment requirements for a unit through knowledge, understanding or skills they already possess and do not need to develop through a course of learning.

8.2.2 Note: RPL should not be confused with exemption, unit equivalency or credit accumulation and transfer.

8.2.3 RPL enables recognition of achievement from a range of activities using any appropriate assessment methodology. Provided that the assessment requirements of a given unit or qualification have been met, the use of RPL is acceptable for accrediting a unit, units or a whole qualification. Partial unit completion is not acceptable. Evidence of learning must be:

- Valid
- Reliable

8.3 Terminology

8.3.1 RPL policies and procedures have been developed over time which has led to the use of a number of terms to describe the process. Among the most common are:

- Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL)
- Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL) Accreditation of Prior Achievement (APA)
- Accreditation of Prior Learning and Achievement (APLA).

These terms broadly describe the same process. This policy uses the term Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL).

8.4 Amplification

8.4.1 RPL can be used where a learner has not had their prior learning formally recognised.

8.4.2 RPL focuses on assessment and awarding for prior learning which may count as evidence towards:

- A unit accumulated towards a full qualification.
- A unit or units recognised by a Pearson Certificate of Achievement of a full Pearson qualification (or equivalent exam board).

8.4.3 All evidence must be evaluated using the stipulated learning outcomes and assessment criteria from the qualification or unit being claimed. In assessing a unit using RPL the assessor must be satisfied that the evidence produced by the learner meets the assessment standard established by the learning outcome and its related assessment criteria. Evidence used for RPL will be subject to standards verification as normal.

8.4.4 Most often RPL will be used for units. It is acceptable to claim for an entire qualification through RPL although this is not the normal practice because it would be unusual for a learner to be able to offer prior achievement that completely matches every aspect of a qualification's assessment requirements.

8.4.5 The prior achievement that would provide evidence of current knowledge, understanding and skills will vary from sector to sector. It will depend on the extent of the experience, technological changes and the nature of the outcome claimed. If

the currency of any evidence is in doubt, the assessor may use questions to check understanding, and ask for the demonstration of skills to check competence. Note that the assessment strategy for each qualification must be adhered to.

8.4.6 Where evidence is assessed to be only sufficient to cover one or more learning outcomes, or to partly meet the need of a learning outcome, then additional assessment methods should be used to generate sufficient evidence to be able to award the learning outcome(s) for the whole unit.

8.4.7 Where Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning evidence is being assessed against graded units, only pass criteria can be awarded.

8.4.8 The RPL process is not concerned with allowing for exceptional entry to, or exemption from, a programme of study.

8.4.9 NCLT will ensure that:

- Identification of any achievement through RPL is prior to learners taking a qualification.
- Relevant to the learner's knowledge, skills and understanding which will be assessed as part of a qualification.
- Learners are registered as soon as they formally start to gather evidence.
- Records of assessment against prior learning are maintained.
- Certification claims are made according to normal procedures.
- All relevant evidence is assessed before assessment decisions are confirmed.
- There are designated personnel (exams officers) with the appropriate expertise to support and assure the RPL process.

8.5 <u>The RPL Process</u>

8.5.1 Stage 1 - Awareness, information and guidance

Ahead of enrolling a potential student, the possibility that they may be able to claim unit(s) for some of their previous learning and/or experience should be raised with them. If the student is interested in this, they will need to know the:

- Process of claiming achievement by using RPL
- Sources of support and guidance available to them
- Timelines, appeals processes and any fees involved

8.5.2 Stage 2 - Pre-assessment, gathering evidence and giving information

At this stage the student will carry out the process of collecting evidence against the requirements of the relevant unit(s). In some cases the development of an assessment plan and tracking document or similar may be required, to support the learner through the process. The evidence gathered will need to meet the standards of the unit, or part of unit, that the evidence is being used for.

8.5.3 Stage 3 - Assessment/documentation of evidence

Assessment as part of RPL is a structured process for gathering and reviewing evidence and making judgments about a students' prior learning and experience in relation to unit standards. The assessor may be looking at work experience records, validated by managers; previous portfolios of evidence put together by the learner or essays and reports validated as being the learner's own unaided work.

Assessment must be valid and reliable to ensure the integrity of the award of unit(s) and, as above, the evidence gathered needs to meet the standards of the unit, or part of unit, that the evidence is being used for. If the collated evidence of RPL for a learner is judged by the centre not to be sufficient to meet all the requirements of the relevant unit(s), then the learner will have to complete the normal assessment for those unit(s) if they wish to be awarded the qualification.

The assessment process will be subject to the usual quality assurance procedures of the centre, for example internal standardisation and internal verification. Evidenced gathered through RPL should be clearly referenced and sign posted to aid internal assessment and internal and external verification.

8.5.4 Stage 4 - Claiming certification

RPL processes and evidence used by centres will be subject to the normal standards verification process. Pearson will check RPL via its external verification processes, and if Pearson identify that not all requirements for a unit have been met via the RPL evidence, then more evidence will be needed or the learner will have to undergo the normal assessment requirements.

Once the internal and external quality assurance procedures have been successfully completed, certification claims can be made by the centre. Assessment and internal verification records, along with any additional RPL records completed, should be retained for the standard three year period following certification.

The assessor must ensure that all learning outcomes and assessment criteria being claimed for each unit are achieved and that the records of assessment are maintained in the usual way.

8.5.5 Stage 5 - Appeals

As with any assessment decision on procedural grounds; if a learner wishes to appeal against a decision made about their assessment they need to follow the standard centre policy and procedures and then Pearson Enquiries and Appeals procedures.

9.0 Registration and Certification Policy and Procedures

9.1 Aims

- To ensure that individual students are registered on the correct programme within agreed timescales.
- To ensure valid student certificates are claimed within the timescales specified by the awarding body.

- To construct a secure, accurate and accessible audit trail to ensure that student's registration and certification claims can be tracked to the certificate which is issued for each student.

9.2 The Centre will:

- Register each student within the awarding body requirements.
- Provide a mechanism for programme teams to check the accuracy of the student registration.
- Make each student aware of their registration status.
- Inform the awarding body of withdrawals, transfers or changes to student's details.
- Inform the awarding body where the centre is able to apply for reasonable adjustments or special consideration for individual students.
- QA submission of grades onto awarding body portals using centre QN's across the three colleges and Trust Directors to ensure accuracy when claiming grades for students.
- Ensure that certificate claims are timely and based solely on internally verified assessment records.
- Audit certificate claims made to the awarding body.
- Audit the certificates received from the awarding body to ensure accuracy and completeness.
- Keep all records safely and securely for three years post certificate.
- Make sure AGQ result sheets are sampled for accuracy across all assessors
-

10.0 Responsibility

Responsible for Policies: Quality Nominee
Responsible for implementation: Course Assessors, LIVs, IVs and QN

10.1 Role of Quality Nominee

Each centre is required to appoint a member of staff as the Quality Nominee. The Quality Nominee acts as the main point of contact for the relevant awarding body and should be someone who has the capacity and authority to act for the centre.

Access to Edexcel Online and the relevant portal for other awarding bodies is essential to gain information such as centre qualification programme details, registrations, the appointment of Centre Quality Reviewers and Standards Verifiers and quality reports.

The Quality Nominee will also be required to liaise with the appropriate Programme Managers and/or Lead Internal Verifiers to ensure that Lead Standards Verifiers and Standards Verifiers are able to carry out their roles.

10.1.1 The Quality Nominee is required to:

- Ensure that up-to-date centre contact email addresses are available, including their own details, using Edexcel Online and the relevant portal for other awarding bodies.

- Ensure the accuracy of centre programme listings and monitor approval of AGQ programmes (including review dates).
- Monitor registrations against approved programmes.
- Liaise with Programme Managers and/or Lead Internal Verifiers to co-ordinate the effective assessment and internal verification of associated programmes.
- Ensure that programme teams are briefed about expectations regarding Edexcel quality assurance processes including:

    ⇨ The nomination of a Lead Internal Verifier for AGQ programmes in each Principal Subject Area.
    ⇨ Standards Verification
    ⇨ The procedures involved with the annual Lead Standards Verifier visit.

- Liaise with Programme Managers to ensure Lead Internal Verifiers:

    ⇨ Complete induction training,
    ⇨ Register for the Lead Internal Verifier role via Edexcel Online or the relevant portal for other awarding bodies, as appropriate
    ⇨ Work through standardisation training, such as OSCA practice/training materials or other suitable materials, with the programme team.
    ⇨ Confirm team members understand quality assurance processes.
    ⇨ Standardise team member's assessment decisions.

- Liaise closely with Heads of Faculty to ensure that the Principal Subject Area Lead Internal Verifiers are scheduling and monitoring internal verification across the programmes delivered in each Principal Subject Area.
- Record and manage the replacement of any Lead Internal Verifier leaving the centre.
- In the event of a Lead Internal Verifier leaving, ensure rigorous internal verification practice continues in the relevant Principal Subject Area and that another member of staff is nominated as the Lead Internal Verifier to carry out induction training, standardisation of the team during the next academic year.
- Monitor re-registration of Lead Internal Verifier annually at the start of each academic year.
- Monitor the standards verification process as follows:

    ⇒ Receive the Standards Verifier allocation for the specific Principal Subject Area.
    ⇒ Liaise with the Standards Verifier regarding samples required.
    ⇒ Ensure that the samples are prepared according to our guidelines and dispatched by the relevant Lead Internal Verifier in good time.
    ⇒ Monitor the results of the sampling process.
    ⇒ Check online portals for Standards Verifier reports. Ensure that Lead Internal Verifiers have access to reports and take appropriate action where necessary.

- Liaise with the LSV to organise the visit and ensure that the programme teams respond appropriately to the visit requirements.
- Complete the Centre Engagement Document prior to the visit.

- Ensure documents and other evidence for the visit clearly show how quality assurance is managed through quality processes within all Principal Subject Areas and qualifications delivered at the centre.
- Monitor the LSV report and manage any follow up actions within 3 months.
- Meet with the Trust Director for Quality and Standards each half term to discuss current practice and highlight any quality concerns.

10.1.2 General Operational Issues

- Ensure parity of provision across all AGQ programmes and sites within the centre.
- Liaise with the Regional Quality Managers regarding any quality issues.
- Encourage quality improvement across programmes by:

  ⇒ Implementing AGQ meetings and forums to disseminate good practice relating to delivery and assessment.
  ⇒ Implementing and maintaining effective processes and records for AGQ programmes.
  ⇒ Briefing vocational course teams of any changes in AGQ programmes and processes.

- Ensure continuity and succession planning is in place for all quality roles including their own.

10.1.3 Lead Internal Verifier is responsible for:

- Ensuring that there is an assessment and verification plan for the programmes in the principal subject area which is fit for purpose.
- Signing off the plan and check that it is being followed at suitable points.
- Undertaking some internal verification and assessment for individual units within at least one of the programs.
- Ensure that records of assessment and samples of learners work are being retained for use with standards verification if necessary. Plan to set aside examples of work verified to different levels and grades.
- Liaise with the standards verifier to ensure that appropriate sampling takes place, if and when required.

10.1.4 Internal verifiers are responsible for:

- Verifying assignment briefs prior to distribution to learners.
- Verifying a sample of assessment decisions.
- Developing the skills of assessors, especially those new to assessment.
- Maintaining the consistency of assessment decisions by holding standardisation meeting of assessors.

10.1.5 It is the responsibility of teachers to:

- Provide assessment processes that are fair and meet the requirements of students and of the qualification.
- Provide students with a schedule of assessment.
- Provide accurate, timely and informative assessment feedback.

- Record assessment decisions regularly, accurately and systematically, using agreed documentation.
- Comply with the College and Awarding Body guidelines regarding work that is submitted after the submission date and work that is re-submitted following a referral decision.
- Familiarise themselves and learners with the College Assessment and Appeals procedure's.
- Be aware of and keep up-to-date with Awarding Body guidance in respect of assessment, standardisation, moderation and verification.
- Ensure that the quality of assessment is assured by carrying out internal standardisation, moderation or verification as required by the College an Awarding Body.
- Record internal standardisation, moderation and verification decision accurately and systematically using agreed documentation.
- Provide special arrangements for learners with learning difficulties and or disabilities according to the regulations of the awarding body.

10.1.6 It is the responsibility of the Exams Office:

- To meet the deadlines for registering learners with the awarding body.
- To ensure that awarding body data is kept up to date with timely withdrawal or transfer of learners.
- To claim learners' certificates as soon as appropriate.
- To claim unit certification when a learner has not been able to complete the full programme of study.

11.0 Blended Learning Policy

11.1 Aims

1. To ensure blended learning delivery meets the guidelines set by the awarding organisation.
2. To ensure assessment methodology is valid, reliable and does not disadvantage any group or individual learners.

11.2 Local/National Lockdowns and Blended Learning

Should the area or the country be placed under lockdown with students not able to attend college, or we have to move to a mode of blended learning combining live lessons in classrooms and remote delivery – depending on the restrictions implemented we:

- Expect staff to still travel into College to use the facilities unless travel restrictions are in place in order to deliver lessons, set work and receive work and provide feedback to students.
- If a staff member has tested positive for COVID-19 they are to follow the government guidance and remain at home for the required period of time. A member of the department will set up the classrooms affected so that the teacher can deliver remotely from home, if they are well enough to do so.

- In incidences where the affected staff are not well enough to deliver remotely lessons will be covered internally, as they would be for any other staff absence, and all lessons for affected groups would continue as normal.
- Teaching staff will deliver timetabled lessons and ensure there is an element of live teaching in every lesson. This will be delivered on Microsoft Teams and assignments are set up in Teams for students to submit work for teachers to mark and to provide feedback on. Students can only submit work using their own accounts to ensure authenticity. Urkund, a plagiarism checking tool has also been built into Teams for teachers to use when assessing student work.
- OneDrive folders are set up for each subject area so that relevant records can be stored centrally and securely.
- Progress Tutors and support staff will continue to support their students.
- If teaching staff are unable to deliver timetabled lessons live due to barriers then we would put in place individual arrangements for their groups including joining other lessons which are taking place at the same time or recording lessons/work to be emailed to students.
- Laptops are available for short and medium term loans to students who have limited / no IT access at home. A student audit has been performed on Pupil Premium students to ensure those without a PC have access to a laptop to take home in the event of a lock down. Sim cards are also available for students who have difficulties purchasing data, where possible and appropriate.

12.0 Access to Policy

- Copies of the policy will be available via the college website.
- Student induction programmes will highlight key aspects of this policy.
- Training for assessors will be given as part of staff induction annually.

Appendix

Assessment calendar 2024-25

DC	Year group	Assessment Dates *Suggested assessment week*	Description	Trust allocated time for marking	Data Collection (DC) deadline	A level	AGQ
1	12	*w/c 16 September 2024	College Assessment • Completion of DIL • Initial assessment • Attitude to learning • Effort and engagement • Attendance and punctuality	Not required for this assessment	Fri 4 October 2024	Red, Amber, Green	Red, Amber, Green
	13	*w/c 23 September 2024	Trust Assessment	Tuesday 1 October in CPD slot	Mon 7 October 2024 9am	Current assessment grade (recent cedar assessment)	Current grade generated from tracker
2	12	*w/c 18 November 2024	Trust Assessment		Fri 6 December 2024 9am	Current assessment grade (recent cedar assessment)	Current grade generated from tracker
	13	Monday 11 November – Monday 18 November	Trust Assessment – **MOCK EXAMS A** - A level and Jan AG entries	Tuesday 19 November from 1pm		Mock grade Estimated grade	Current grade generated from tracker Estimated grade
3	12	*w/c 13 January / 20 January 2025	Trust Assessment	Tuesday 28 January in CPD slot	Fri 14 February 2025 9am	Current assessment grade (recent cedar assessment)	Current grade generated from tracker
	13	Monday 20 January – Monday 27 January	Trust Assessment – **MOCK EXAMS B** - A level	Wednesday 29 January from 1pm		Mock grade	Current grade generated from tracker
4	12	* w/c 3 March 2025	Trust Assessment	Tuesday 18 March in CPD slot	Fri 4 April 2025 9am	Current assessment grade (recent cedar assessment)	Current grade generated from tracker
	12/13	Monday 17 March – Friday 21 March	Applied General Mock Exams - AG summer entries				Current grade generated from tracker
	13	* w/c 3 March 2025	Trust Assessment			Mock grade Estimated grade to include NEA/coursework	Current grade generated from tracker Estimated grade
5	12	Wednesday 30 April – Thursday 8 May *NCP begins 29 April	Trust Progression Exams	Thursday 15 May from 1pm	Thurs 22 May 2025 4pm	Current assessment grade (recent cedar assessment)	Current grade generated from tracker

Policy Status			
Policy Lead (Title)	Trust Director Quality and Standards	**Review Period**	Annual
Reviewed By	Trust Executive Team	**Equality Impact Assessment Completed (Y/N)**	Y

POLICY AMENDMENTS				
Version	**Approval Date**	**Trade Union Consultation Date (if applicable)**	**Page No./Paragraph No.**	**Amendment**
2020-21		N/A		
2020-21 Version 2	05/042021	N/A	Throughout	Updated formatting throughout
				Change of title from 'Vocational Centre Handbook' to 'Applied General Handbook'
				Assessment dates moved to Appendix
				Amended to make a single policy applicable to all three colleges
2021-22	09/11/2021	N/A	Para 1.4	Updated vision.
			Para 2.1.3	'learner' changed to 'student'
			Para 2.5	Section updated for 2021-22
			Para 5.1.3	Addition of 'via video messages recorded by the QN.' Change of 'Urkund' to 'Ouriginal'
			Para 6.4	Additional section on appealing TAGs
			Para 10.1.1	Addition of final bullet point
			Section 11	Addition of entire section.
2022-23	21/06/2022	N/A		
2023-24	31/08/2023	N/A		
2024-25	TET 09/10/24	N/A	Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.3	Updated links to JCQ documents and forms
			Section 2.2.2	Updated process for requesting extensions
			Section 2.2.3	Added last paragraph that outlines how students can request reasonable adjustments where these aren't already visible on Cedar
			Section 3.0	Updated to reflect current academic year
			Section 5.1.1	Added information about assignment submission via Microsoft Teams and learner authentication statements being included in Teams assignment wording
			Section 5.3.4	Added reference to showing the student AGQ video as a compulsory activity
			Section 10	Updated to include reference to other awarding bodies
			Equality Impact Assessment	Reviewed in light of above changes

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

The completion of this document is a requirement for all existing and proposed New Collaborative Learning Trust (NCLT) policies, major procedures, practices and plans (hereafter referred to as policies) as well as whenever looking at policy updates.

The Equality Act 2010 sets out our legal duty to undertake equality analysis of all trust/college policies. Completion of this EIA is the first step in meeting this duty. Please send the completed EIA (together with a copy of the related policy/draft policy document) to the Trust Director for Human Resources who will review the document and may refer to the Equality and Diversity Committee as necessary to advise on any follow up action that might be required.

Completion of the Equality Impact Assessment is part of the Specific Equality Duties (SED) required of the trust. Over arching the specific duties is the General Equality Duty (GED) required of everyone. Please bear the GED and SED in mind when undertaking this audit.

General Equality Duty

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Specific Equality Duties Relevant to EIA are to provide:

- Sufficient information to demonstrate compliance with the general duties; including effects policies have on people.
- Evidence that analysis of this information has been undertaken.
- Details of information considered during analysis.
- Details of engagement (consultation) that has taken place.

Protected Characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender Reassignment
- Marriage/Civil Partnership
- Pregnancy/Maternity Leave
- Race
- Religion or Belief
- Sex
- Sexual Orientation

Audit Prompt	Response
Name of policy	Applied General Handbook
Author of document:	Chelsea Branson-Webster 7 Oct 2024 changes – Daniel Wood
Responsible Senior Manager:	Daniel Wood and Jim Robinson
Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy.	To ensure that all staff adhere to the standards of assessment in Applied General Qualifications. Making sure that our practice is consistent, transparent and in line with the requirements of our awarding bodies.
Who does the policy apply to: • Staff • Learners (please indicate which groups) • Members of the general public (please specify)	Staff

Will the policy affect members of the target audience equally? If no, please indicate the specific groups targeted by the policy. In targeting the policy at a specific group of people will members of other groups be disadvantaged? If yes, how will this be addressed? What information has been gathered about the diversity of the target audience? Attach details of information considered. How has this diversity been taken into account in writing the policy?	Yes
Does this policy contain visual images? If yes, are these technical or cultural in nature? If cultural, do they reflect diversity? If yes, please indicate how.	No
Please indicate how this policy supports the trust/college in its General Equality Duty to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation (A). • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not (B). • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not (C).	A) By providing clear guidelines that staff must follow when assessing and verifiying all student work. Therefore preventing students with a protected characteristic being discriminated against. B) The policy does not do this. C) The policy does not do this.
Please indicate any negative impacts identified in relation to the protected characteristics listed below, or how you have arrived at the view that there are not negative impacts in relation to these characteristics: Age Disability Gender Reassignment Marriage/Civil Partnership Pregnancy/Maternity Leave	No impacts identified.

Race Religion or Belief Sex Sexual Orientation	
Is the policy free from discrimination on the grounds of: • Additional Learning Needs • Economic Needs • Social Needs	Yes
Please indicate who the policy has been considered by and/or who has been consulted about the policy. Where applicable include: • Staff/student consultative groups • Trade unions • Equality and Diversity, Health and Safety and Safeguarding Committee • Other committees/working groups (specify) • Senior Management Team • Trust Executive Team • Board of Directors • External group / Advisory group (specify)	31/8/23 amendments: Working groups (Quality Nominees from each college) SLT members within the Trust Trust Executive Team 7/10/24 amendments: Working group - Quality Nominees from each college
Can you identify any further consultations that might be necessary to ensure no adverse impact? If yes, please specify.	No
Can you identify any differential or adverse impact the policy might have that is not already recorded? If yes, please specify.	No
How would you assess the overall impact of this policy on equality? Please circle.	High / Medium / **Low**
Please record who this audit has been completed by (if by committee/work group please indicate and get lead person to sign off):	Name : Daniel Wood Job Title : Joint Temporary Trust Director for Quality and Standards Date 07.10.24