



Dō

Evaluation policy of the

Dō University

March 2025



Content

1. Introduction	3
2. Scope and purpose	3
3. Evaluation principles	3
4. Guarantee of academic standards	6
5. Evaluation support systems.....	6
6. Conducting the evaluation	7
...	
7. Rating and Scoring	7
8. Retention of Evidence.....	8
9. Appeals Process	8
10. Retention of student evidence	9
11. Review of the evaluation standards.....	9
12. Authentication of student work	9
13. Monitoring student progress.....	10
14. Academic malpractice	10
15. Procedure for acting in cases of academic malpractice	13
16. Poor management	15
Malpractice	19
....	
Conflict of Interest Policy.....	20
Roles and responsibilities in the evaluation.....	23
Internal verification sampling	26
Extenuating Circumstances Form	27
Appeals Process.....	29
Student Appeal Form (Sample).....	31
Receiving Portfolio, Assignment, or Student Work	33
New presentation of evidence	34
ChatGPT and AI Chatbots Usage Policy.....	35
Continuing professional development for staff.....	38
Share the evaluation policy.....	39

1. Introduction

1.1. Assessment is fundamental to the learning experience of students.

Students. Progression in a program and validation of success or failure are determined by evaluation.

1.2. The evaluation can be:

- **Diagnosis**–identify a skill or attribute that suggests a path appropriate learning and identify learning difficulties that require support.
- **Formative**–Allow students to get feedback on progress and point out areas and strategies for improvement.
- **Summative**–Provides a clear statement of performance in relationship with the established objectives.

2. Scope and purpose

2.1. The purpose of the policy is to establish the teaching, learning and evaluation that the school undertakes to carry out with all groups of students enrolled at Dō University.

2.2. The College recognizes that different groups of students will have different needs and this policy is designed to ensure treatment consistent, effective and fair for all.

2.3. The policy should be read in conjunction with other school policies and procedures, including the Student Code of Conduct, equality policies and diversity and higher education.

3. Evaluation principles

- 3.1. The purpose of the assessment is to enable students to demonstrate that they have met the learning outcomes established in a unit and that have met the required standard for the granting of credits, in accordance with the criteria of the agency grantor. In most cases, the assessment will quantify the level of performance through letter grades (AU), grades numerical (1-9), percentages or a rating system approved/merit/distinction.
- 3.2. Students should only be assessed according to the assessment criteria published in the course specifications. These are set in accordance with the national standards set out in the course specifications. It is essential that the teacher/assessor reads the requirements of the specifications and ensure that the assessment is adequate.
- 3.3. Students must be informed, in advance, of the methods of assessment used in conjunction with a Task Plan for the course program.
- 3.4. There should be adequate methods for recording and communicating the results of the assessment, as well as to provide feedback to students. Whenever possible, feedback should be constructive.
- 3.5. Evaluation methods for the exchange of work practices must be clearly communicated to students before starting the relevant study period and applied consistently.
- 3.6. Procedures must exist to maintain standards within the College and ensure comparability between internal and external curricular areas the courses they teach.
- 3.7. Graded work should be scored to show where the requirements have been met. task criteria.

3.8. Evaluation processes must be fair, transparent, reliable and valid.

A conflict of interest may arise when a teacher or evaluator has a personal relationship with a student or apprentice (such as a bond family, business, etc.), this should be declared. Whenever possible, the work must be assessed by a different member of staff. If this does not
It is possible, all the work evaluated by that teacher/evaluator for the student/apprentice must be...

Subject to second grading or moderation. A grade must be recorded.
indicate the personal relationship in the course record; it can be included in the confidential notes if necessary.

3.9. If a student declares to have a disability or learning difficulty and

considers that this would harm your progress in the degree, you should contact the Further Learning Support team to check if you should request a reasonable accommodation or special consideration. This must be completed before the start of the assessment. An adaptation will be applied reasonable if the student would otherwise be harmed. Any adaptation must be agreed with the Internal Verifier, recorded as a note in the evaluation file and shown to any Verifier
External.

3.10. There should be regular standardization/EV/IV meetings, verification of leading standards/leading IV by the curriculum team.

3.11. Evaluator of apprentices / Trainers / Teachers

The following methods are examples of the different types of evaluation that can be used to gather appropriate evidence to support the rating decisions:

- Observation
- Professional discussion
- Photographic evidence provided by the student showing who performed a relevant skill.
- Obtain feedback from the employer, especially in relationship with behaviors

- Questions and answers
- Video and voice recordings: The student must provide these recordings.
- Reflective story
- Witness statements
- About program evaluation: evidence of actual work completed during learning

4. Guarantee of academic standards

4.1. All courses offered by the Faculty are subject to a rigorous selection process. approval, both internal and external (granting body). This is reflected in follow-up measures such as internal and external verification, visits to quality review and development, and curriculum planning.

4.2. The responsibility for the validation and review of the courses is carried out by the curriculum leaders, learning managers, verifiers internal and external verifiers.

4.3. Course validation and review panels consider the standard of the course in relation to all relevant criteria documents of the Faculty and granting bodies.

5. Evaluation support systems

5.1. The School employs a rigorous routine for monitoring courses.

5.2. The School has a very effective Quality Cycle integrated into the Teaching and Learning. This cycle holds teams accountable for excellence in the regulatory evaluation processes.

5.3. Training is offered to all teaching staff to develop their skills. knowledge and skills in evaluation design. This training It may consist of induction sessions, training events, workshops professional development and workshops. The College has an exceptional program of continuing professional development (CPD).

- 5.4. Standardization and moderation meetings are held periodically.
to help staff evaluate fairly and equitably.

6. Conducting the assessment

- 6.1. At the beginning of the course, guidelines should be distributed.
evaluation of each student.
- 6.2. The work submitted by the student is final. The entity's policies
grantor may allow a resubmission or the opportunity to resubmit
perform the evaluation. To grant a new presentation or a retake,
the policies and procedures of the granting entity must be complied with.
- 6.3. If a student or group is clearly not able to successfully complete the
task, the teacher must suspend the assessment, resume teaching and then
restart the task when students are ready to complete it.
- 6.4. The assessment must be completed on time. If the student feels that he/she is not
cannot deliver the work on time due to extenuating circumstances, you must
request an extension of the deadline using the circumstances form
mitigating circumstances. Appendix F .
- 6.5. Academic misconduct

The College firmly believes in the importance of integrity of conduct
academic and takes any type of academic misconduct very seriously.
have established procedures to address suspected cases
that students and staff commit academic misconduct. If proven, this
may, in the most serious cases, lead to expulsion from the College. The alleged
Staff misconduct in evaluations will be managed through the
disciplinary procedure.

7. Rating and qualification

- 7.1. All grades will be awarded according to the grading system
from the corresponding granting body.

7.2. The main objective of Internal Verification is to ensure the application coherent assessment criteria, both in the units/modules individual as well as throughout the course. Internal verification may consist of double qualification, team qualification or sampling.

8. Withholding evidence

8.1. Students must keep a duplicate copy of the work qualified, whether in electronic or physical format, for the duration of the course.

8.2. The student's original evidence must be kept secure for 12 weeks after students have been certified.

8.3. Monitoring documents/assessment records must be kept for 3 years.

8.4. 'It is important that the center safely stores evidence in the on which a student's grade is based, including copies of the student's work student when available and any records of qualifications; will be necessary for:

- Support the center's determination of student grades;
- Internal and external quality assurance processes;
and
- 'The appeals process.

9. Appeals process

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

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

- 9.2. Students wishing to appeal are advised to do so within the
four business weeks after the submission of the evaluated work.
appeals after that deadline will be considered, but students
You should keep in mind that the faculty will not be able to...
Rating changes may be limited by the regulations of the awarding body.
- 9.3. The School is committed to open and fair assessment. Students
must participate in the evaluation process. They must be clearly explained the
purpose of the assessment and the requirements to achieve a grade or level
of competence. They should also be provided with feedback
constructive feedback that clearly explains why they have been given a rating.

10. Retention of student evidence

- 10.1. Students will be informed that the awarding body may require the
inspection of their portfolios up to one year after certification, so the
assessment center may also require them.
- 10.2. Student evidence portfolios that are not claimed by the
student after a period of one year will be destroyed.
- 10.3. Copies of achievement notification forms and records of
Certification from the granting body must be kept at the Office of
Examinations over a period of five years (or longer where required by law)
regulations of the granting body).

11. Review of the evaluation regulations

- 11.1. Quality review and development controls are carried out by the agency
corresponding grantor.

12. Authentication of student work

- 12.1. In each assignment, students must sign that the work submitted is theirs and the Teachers/assessors must confirm that the assessed work is solely of the student in question and was carried out under the required conditions.
- 12.2. If the student submits an assignment and the teachers suspect that it is not correct, In the case of the student's own work, the subject must be be reported to the Teaching and Learning Manager, who must proceed from in accordance with the Academic Malpractice section (14 and 15) of this policy.

13. Monitoring student progress

13.1. The College:

- Maintain systematic records of achievements, progress and student attendance.
- Engage students in self-assessment and reflection on their own progress.
- Feedback to students on their progress and setting specific goals for improvement.

14. Academic malpractice

14.1. Malpractice Notification

Candidates will be notified and warned about malpractice. various ways, including:

- School exam sites on the student intranet which include all relevant JCQ warnings and notifications.
- Exam registration emails that link to the Intranet site.
- The school's parent portal that publishes the same information for parents and guardians.

14.2. Bad practices by students

14.3. All evaluable elements must be the student's own work; when

If this is not the case, it will be treated as a case of academic malpractice.

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

Defrauding or deceiving others. Includes the following:

- Collusion: When a student works fraudulently with another (or others) that are being evaluated independently (fully or partially) in the same module.
- Plagiarism: "taking and using the thoughts, writings, and inventions of another" person as one's own" (Oxford English Dictionary). All citations should use the Harvard APA referencing system.
- To commission: to get another person(s) to complete a task work, which is later claimed as one's own work of the student.
- Identity theft: when someone carries out a exam or assessment by impersonating someone else.
- Syndication: The presentation of substantially similar works by two or more publishers. more students, whether in the same institution or in several institutions, at the same time or at different times.
- Data falsification: when the data has been invented, copied, altered or obtained by unfair means.
- Complicity: When a student assists another student in any form of dishonest academic practice.
- Professional misconduct: when, in the course of your assessed work, Students in professional courses act in a way that violates the relevant Code of Professional Conduct.

14.5. In all cases of academic malpractice or any other form of attempt to gain an unfair advantage, Dō University confirms:

- The right of the College to delay making a decision on the student's results until the results have been established facts;

- The College's ability to judge the seriousness of the offense academic and exercise their discretion.

14.6. Malpractice by the Center's staff may be committed by a member of staff or a contractor.

Examples of **professional negligence** include:

- Failure to keep exam materials secure before an exam;
- discuss or otherwise disclose secure information in public, for example example, in Internet forums;
- Moving the time or date of a scheduled exam beyond what is permitted in the JCQ publication "Exam Instructions". Conduct An exam before the published date constitutes malpractice. center staff and a clear breach of security.
- failure to adequately supervise candidates who have been affected by a schedule variation; (This would apply to candidates subject to nighttime supervision by the center's staff or when necessary take an exam in a session before or after the scheduled day).
- Allowing, facilitating, or obtaining unauthorized access to exam materials before an exam;
- Failure to retain or secure exam papers after a exam, when its validity extends beyond the call. By example, when one or more candidates must take an exam in a later call due to a schedule change.
- manipulating candidate exams, controlled assessments, coursework or non-exam related assessments after its collection and before sending it to the organization adjudicator/examiner/moderator; (This would also include reading the candidates' exams or photocopy them before sending them to the agency adjudicator/examiner).
- Failure to keep candidates' computer files secure contain controlled assessments, coursework or non-assessments exam-related.

- Releasing candidates from a scheduled assessment early (for example, before 10 am for a session exam the morning).

15. Procedure for dealing with academic malpractice

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

15.2. A minor case: for example, presenting a brief extract of a completed work

by another person as one's own and not cite the source. It is necessary to follow the guidelines of the JCQ awarding body.

- The case will be discussed with the student in a private tutorial with the teacher of the subject, the person responsible for the study program and the person responsible for teaching and learning.
- The student will be given a warning about future actions.
- The work grades will be discounted (which can be 6% as a guide) or the work will be returned to the student to be redone and hand it in for correction.
- If this has happened before, the student will move directly to a second-stage reference interview.
- If the student is working for an exam, the Examinations Office will inform the corresponding granting body in accordance with the policy of the granting body.

15.3. A moderate case, e.g., presenting a substantial extract from a work

produced by another as one's own and not citing the source; inventing data and using it in a job that requires the collection of valid data or the repetition of a infraction that constitutes a minor offense.

- The case will be discussed with the student in a private tutorial with the teacher of the subject, the person responsible for the study program and the person responsible for teaching and learning.
- The grade or assessment score will be reduced or the student will be sanctioned. zero is awarded, depending on the severity of the case.

- The student may not be allowed to retake the unit/exam/test.
- The Examinations Office will inform the relevant examining body of in accordance with the policy of the granting body.

15.4. A serious case, for example, obtaining work done by someone else and presenting it as own; arrange for another person to take an exam in one's place; fabrication or falsification of research to support an analysis or recurrence of an offense that constitutes moderate misconduct.

- The Examination Office will inform the awarding body relevant in accordance with its policy.
- The case will be discussed with the student in a private tutorial with the professor of the subject, the Program Manager and the Head of Teaching and Learning.
- A penalty will be imposed, as agreed with the agency adjudicator. The sanction will depend on the severity of the violation. may apply any of the following sanctions:
 - A grade of zero is given in the exam/test/module or the assessed work does not obtain qualification
 - The student is disqualified from the course.

15.5. In all cases, a record will be kept in the student's file of the complaint, the outcome and any sanctions imposed. This information may be used by the College when asked to provide a reference.

15.6. Academic malpractice by the center's staff

All complaints of malpractice or maladministration will be handled in accordance with the Faculty's Disciplinary Policy and Procedure. The Examinations Office will inform of the case to the granting entity, in accordance with its policy, using the JCQ form M2 (b) or its substitute.

sixteen. Poor management

16.1. Failure to comply with the rules relating to the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework, exams and non-exam related assessments, or poor practice in carrying out exams/assessments and/or in handling the exam questionnaires, candidate exams, worksheets grades, cumulative assessment records, results and certificate claim forms, etc.

Granting organizations will investigate credible allegations of malpractice. praxis or problems detected in our supervision processes that raise concerns about non-compliance with published requirements for the determination of grades. Some examples include:

- Exam registrations are created for students who have not studied the entrance course or did not intend to enter.
- Grades created for students who have not been taught sufficient content to provide the basis for that rating.
- A teacher who deliberately and inappropriately ignores politics published by the center when determining grades.
- A teacher who fabricates evidence of a candidate's performance to support an inflated rating.
- A teacher who deliberately provides inappropriate levels of support before or during an assessment, including deliberate disclosure of schemes grading and assessment materials, to support an inflated grade.
- A teacher who intentionally submits inflated grades.
- Failure to retain evidence used in the determination of the grades according to the grading guide of the JCQ.
- Systematic non-compliance with the center's policy regarding the application of access agreements or consideration agreements

special for students in relation to the assessments used to determine grades.

- Failing to take reasonable steps to authenticate student work.
- Failure to properly manage conflicts of interest (COI) within from a center.
- Failure by the Head of the Centre to submit the statement required at the time of submitting your ratings.
- Grades will be given to students (or their parents/guardians) before the results are released.
- Inappropriate staff members evaluating students candidates for access agreements.
- Do not use current tasks for assessments.
- Failure to adequately train supervisors, leading to failure to comply with the JCQ publication 'Instructions for the conduct of exams'.
- Failure to issue candidates with appropriate notices and warnings, for example For example, the JCQ 'Information for Candidates' documents.
- Failure to inform the JCQ Center Inspection Service about alternative sites for the exams.
- Do not place notices related to the exam or assessment outside of all the rooms (including the Music and Art rooms) where exams are held and evaluations.
- Failure to ensure that the exam site meets the requirements stipulated in the JCQ publication 'Instructions for the performance of exams'.
- The introduction of unauthorized material into the examination room, either before or during the exam; (NB this excludes the use of the exam room for training to the candidates or give topic-specific presentations, including PowerPoint presentations, before the start of the exam).

- Not reminding candidates that any mobile phone or other Unauthorized items found in your possession must be handed in to the supervisor before the exam begins.
- Failure to supervise exams in accordance with the JCQ publication 'Instructions for conducting exams'.
- Failure to keep on file, for inspection purposes, accurate records related to with the night supervision agreements.
- Failure to have on file for inspection purposes appropriate evidence, according to the JCQ publication 'Access Agreements and Reasonable Adjustments', for substantiate the processed approved access agreements electronically through the online access agreement system.
- Granting access agreements to candidates who do not meet the JCQ publication requirements 'Access and Adjustment Agreements' reasonable'.
- Grant access agreements to candidates when the right has not been obtained prior approval of the online system of access agreements or, in the case of a more complex agreement, from a granting body.
- Failure to effectively monitor printing tasks computer-based when required.
- Failure to securely store controlled assessments, work assignments, course or non-exam assessments of candidates after the authentication statements have been signed or have graded the work.
- Failure to maintain the security of candidates' exams before send them to the awarding body or the examiner.
- Do not submit exams, coursework, or unrelated assessments with timely examinations of candidates to the agencies grantors, examiners or moderators.
- Failure to immediately notify the relevant awarding body of all

alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice.

- Failure to conduct a thorough investigation into alleged wrongdoing practices in examinations or evaluations when requested a contracting body.
- Failure to comply with the provisions published for the publication of the exam results.
- Improper retention or destruction of certificates.

Appendix A

Professional negligence

This section of our Center Policy describes the measures implemented to prevent malpractice and other breaches of examination regulations, and to address such cases do occur.

When this proves impossible, the policy describes how to handle cases accordingly. with the requirements of the awarding organization.

- All personnel involved have been informed of these policies and have received training on them as needed.

This section describes the agreements we have established to ensure that the relevant assessment documentation and evidence can be provided in a manner timely for the purposes of external quality assurance sampling and that staff can be available to answer questions.

- All personnel involved have been informed about the requirements of the awarding organization for External Quality Assurance, as established in it **JCQ Orientation**.
- All necessary records of decision-making in relation to the determination of the qualifications have been properly preserved and can be made available for review when necessary.
- All student evidence on which decisions regarding the child were based the determination of the qualifications has been preserved and can be put to available for review as needed.
- Mechanisms have been established to respond fully and quickly to any additional requirements or reviews that may be identified as result of the external quality assurance process.
- Staff have been informed that failure to respond appropriately complete and effective compliance with such additional requirements may result in measures additional fees from awarding organizations, including withholding of the results.

- For further guidelines, please refer to each granting agency's guidelines.
of awards, for example, the JCQ guidelines on malpractice and the EAL guidelines on malpractice.[City & Guilds: Management of suspected malpractice cases in exams and evaluations](#)

Appendix B

Conflict of Interest Policy

1. Objective

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance on the management of potential conflicts of interest that may arise and, in this way, protect the reputation of the UNIVERSITY in terms of its high academic standards. It guarantees compliance by the UNIVERSITY of the regulatory requirements of accrediting bodies and preserves the integrity of the Group.

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

2. This policy:

- Defines what is meant by conflict of interest in relation to the evaluation and establishes the roles and responsibilities for managing conflicts of interest.
- Illustrates possible conflict of interest situations.

3. Scope

It is the policy of Dō University that faculty, evaluators, and internal verifiers acting on behalf of the university must be free from conflicts of interest that might adversely affect their judgment or objectivity toward the organization when conducting business activities and evaluations.

4. Definition of conflict of interest

For the purposes of this policy, a conflict of interest is defined as a situation in which

A person's professional judgment is compromised as a result of interests or

Conflicting loyalties. This can occur as a result of any of the following:

circumstances:

- Dō University employees study for an award that is evaluated by their peers.
- A relative, friend or colleague is a student for whom a staff member is responsible for assessment, internal quality control or examination supervision.
- Teachers and evaluators involved in the appointment, supervision, evaluation, or assessment of a person with whom the person has close or family ties.

Appendix C

- A person who is involved in the development, delivery or award of qualifications on the part of the organization has interests in any other activity that has the potential to lead that person to act against his or her interests in that development, delivery or concession in accordance with the conditions of recognition of the granting organization.
- An informed and reasonable observer would conclude that any of the situations mentioned was correct.

5. Roles and responsibilities

All relevant staff carrying out the assessment ('assessors'), moderation ('moderators' or 'verifiers') and others have a responsibility to be aware of the possibility that there is a conflict of interest.

These situations must be managed carefully to ensure that any conflict of interests do not negatively affect the standards of the university and its governing bodies awarding and inspection, as well as public trust.

It is the responsibility of all teachers and evaluators to inform their students in writing. hierarchical superiors about any conflict of interest, real or potential. information submitted is evaluated to determine if additional action is required. keeps a written record of the evaluation result, a copy of which will be delivered to the affected people.

If the interested party presents any change in his declared circumstances, he must inform immediately in writing to your superior, so that the evaluation can be carried out conflict of interest and update the record.

6. Procedures

The curriculum/examination management team or the teaching manager and learning will take steps to manage conflict using any of the following strategies:

Appendix D

- In the first instance, seek to appoint an assessor/supervisor/IQA who does not have any personal or professional relationship with the student(s).
- Ensure that any assessment carried out where there is a conflict of interests are secured internally by another member of staff.
- Inform the granting body if the teacher is the only specialist available in that subject area to request your permission and organize any exams additional in order to monitor fair and impartial approaches.
- Record the conflict of interest in the “conflict of interest register” that maintains the examination team and, in the case of higher education, notes the conflicts of interest and strategies to mitigate the risk in the minutes of the examination board.
- Provide details of conflicts of interest to quality insurers external and visiting external examiners or other persons associated with the body granting the relevant qualifications.

Appendix E

Roles and responsibilities in the evaluation

The role of the student

It is important for students to understand why they produce their work.
course and complete it on time, to ensure timely completion of the course.

- Students should be familiar with the assessment sections of their course manuals and extended work schemes.
- Through the Course Manual, work schemes and instructions assignments, students must know the assessment criteria for each project, task and unit.
- Your responsibility is to meet the evaluation deadlines and submit all the work for evaluation as required in the report.
- Attend the assessment when necessary and have all work done appropriate available.
- Participate fully in group and individual assessments.

Roles in internal verification

They know the criteria for extenuating circumstances if they cannot meet the deadline of evaluation.

The role of the subject teacher/evaluator

The subject teacher is responsible for the evaluation process in the units that imparts, providing guidance to help students improve,
Correcting common mistakes in English and math and ensuring relevance vocational.

The role of the internal verifier

The internal verifier can be any member of the course team who has not participated in the original evaluation and that:

- A good understanding of the assessment requirements of the relevant contracting body.
- Knowledge of the subject to be verified.
- Be a critical friend and suggest improvements.

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

The role of the Lead Internal Verifier (Edexcel) or the Lead Internal Quality Assurer (City & Guilds)

The role of Principal Internal Verifier/Quality Assurer is key to ensuring the assessment standards. This staff member is responsible for overseeing the internal verification of a specific group of courses, provide training to evaluators and Assessment instructors (IV), and formulate assessment policies and processes together with the Manager Quality and the awarding body. The IV Principal must have obtained OSCA accreditation. You must have completed the OSCA registration and standardization activity with the team assessor to be able to supervise the IV of his/her course group. The Principal IQA must have obtained the qualifications required by City & Guilds. The IV Principal/IQA will ensure that All assessors working on qualification attend and participate in the activities of standardization. It will implement a risk-based IV process, providing feedback on good practices and support for evaluators.

The Lead IV will have:

- A good understanding of the assessment requirements and verification by the relevant contracting body.
- OSCA accreditation or be in the process of obtaining OSCA accreditation completed OSCA registration and standardization activity with the team evaluator.
- Completed annual registration as Lead IV, in September 2025.
- Knowledge of the subject to be verified.

The role of the examination office

- Meet the deadlines for registering students with the degree-granting body.
- Ensure that the granting body's data is maintained updated with the timely withdrawal or transfer of students.
- To claim student certificates.
- To claim unit certification when a student has not been able to complete the full program of study.
- Ensure all qualifications are approved by the body relevant accreditor.

Internal verification sampling

Sample IV plans must ensure that ALL assignments/assessments are verify and that the IV documentation is completed and returned.

There must be an IV sample of 20% of the assessed work for each task/assessment.

At the end of the course:

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

Circumstances Form
mitigating factors
Confidential

(Example: adapt to the center's requirements)

Write **CAPITAL LETTERS** your name and the address to which you want the result sent.

Student record			
Last name			
Name(s)			
Course			
Reason for requesting extenuating circumstances (see guidance on the next page)			What is being requested? (e.g., later delivery date)

Evidence

Description (what e.g.	Test (e.g. grade)	Date
	List them all here the documents	

Please note that your case cannot be considered unless it is complete all the previous columns.

Affected unit

Unit affected	Assignment	For use only			
		Date of maturity	Valid	Invalid	Reason(s)

Decision	
Signature	
Date	

Please allow five business days for a decision. Situations of emergencies will be prioritized to be resolved as quickly as possible.

What are extenuating circumstances?

This is any unexpected situation that seriously affects the ability of the student to complete assessments. For example: a serious illness of the student (or someone for whom the student has primary responsibility)

To be considered serious, the illness requires a medical certificate requiring absolute rest or hospitalization. The death of a close relative. Transportation disruptions caused by an unexpected event, like a breakdown in the trains.

The following are not considered extenuating circumstances: loss of job evaluate due to a computer failure, loss or malfunction of a USB flash drive or other storage device. The student must have backup work to multiple locations, including storage in the cloud provided by the university. Minor illnesses or conditions Long-term medical conditions are not considered mitigating circumstances; however, The latter should be considered when planning reasonable adjustments by the teaching and evaluation team.

Transport disruptions caused by planned strikes are not would be counted. Moving or vacations are not extenuating circumstances.

Process of appeal

Stage one

If a student disagrees with an assessment decision, they should be invited to discuss it with the evaluator as soon as possible. You should be invited to explain the reasons for your concern and review the work or tests with the evaluator. The evaluator You must explain in detail the reasons for the rating and listen carefully to the student arguments, taking them duly into account when considering whether the rating should be changed. It is expected that most appeals will not proceed beyond this.

Stage two

If the student is still not satisfied with an assessment decision after Once the first stage has been completed, you should be invited to complete a Student Appeal Form'. [Appendix H](#) .This must be delivered together with the student's work or evidence and any explanation the student wishes include the internal verifier within three business days of receiving the returned work. The internal verifier will reconsider the decision and inform the student of their decision within five business days. If the work has already been internally verified, the teacher will ask another colleague to correct it twice times without review. The decision will also be recorded on the "Appeal Form of the Student".

In case the student is not satisfied with the reconsidered evaluation, the appeal will move to stage three.

Stage three

At this stage, the 'Student Appeal Form' and relevant evidence are will be sent to an Appeal Panel, which will include the student, a friend (if the student so wishes), the original assessor, the internal verifier (from Stage Two) and two members independents appointed by the Teaching and Learning Manager, one of The panel will be designated as chair. The panel will meet at a scheduled time convenient for the student. The panel will make a decision within ten days business days following the meeting and will notify all parties in writing of the outcome.

Student Appeal Form (Sample)

It will be updated once all requirements from the granting body have been received.

Student name	
Program title	

Advisor's name	
Inmate's name Checker	

Unit evaluated	
Nature / Title of Assessment	
Evaluation date	

Reasons for the student's appeal			
Please summarize the reasons for your appeal below.			
Signature		Date	

Advisor's comments			
The evaluator must submit a brief response/comment on the reasons stated by the student for the appeal.			
Signature		Date	

Comments and decision of the internal verifier			
IV should briefly comment on the student's appeal and record its decision.			
Appeal of date received		Date of answer	
IV signature		Date	

Comments and decision of the appeal panel			
The chair of the appeal panel should briefly comment on the student's appeal and record the panel's decision.			
Date appeal received		Date of answer	
Signature		Date	

Portfolio, Assignment, or Student Work Receipt

Curriculum Area	
Course	
Student name	
Unit number and title	

Student statement

I confirm that I have received this evaluated work, that I accept the qualification and

I acknowledge the responsibility of its custody.

Student signature	
Date	

New presentation of evidence

When can a lead internal verifier authorize a new submission?

The lead internal verifier can only authorize a new submission if the following conditions are met:

all of the following conditions:

- The student has met the initial deadlines established in the task or has complied with an agreed extension of the deadline.
- The student has correctly authenticated the evidence.
- The evaluator considers that the student will be able to produce evidence improved without further guidance.
- The evaluator has authenticated the evidence presented for evaluation.

What happens if a student does not meet all the conditions?

If a student has not met these conditions, the Internal Verifier

Principal must **No** authorize a new submission.

Procedure for the resubmission of evidence

If the lead internal verifier authorizes a new submission, there is a clear and simple procedure that will be applied uniformly to all students and centers.

Forms and deadlines

If the lead internal auditor authorizes a new submission, he or she must:

- It will be recorded in the evaluation log.
- Set a deadline for resubmission within 15 days
business days* after the student receives** the results of the assessment.
- Be completed by the student without any additional guidance.

* 15 business days must be within the school term, in the same academic year as the original presentation and must not coincide with a holiday period if the Students study part-time; this is the equivalent of 15 days of "work time" study" to ensure that all students are treated fairly.

* * Students should receive feedback close to the assessment date. Evaluators are not allowed to keep it until the next quarter, so example, just before the week of resubmission of works or at the end of the year, once the student's overall performance in the grade is known.

Opportunities to resubmit evidence

Since each assignment contributes to the final grade, students can have right to one resubmission of evidence for each task submitted. Your Verifier Interval Principal can authorize a redelivery, ensuring that the implemented fairly and consistently for all students.

When can a lead internal verifier authorize a new submission?

The lead internal verifier can only authorize a new submission if the following conditions are met: all of the following conditions:

- The student has met the initial deadlines established in the task or has complied with an agreed extension of the deadline.
- The student has correctly authenticated the evidence.
- The evaluator considers that the student will be able to produce evidence improved without further guidance.
- The evaluator has authenticated the evidence presented for evaluation.

What happens if a student does not meet all the conditions?

If a student has not met these conditions, the Internal Verifier Principal must **No** authorize a new submission.

ChatGPT and AI Chatbots Usage Policy

Aim

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

Definition

ChatGPT and AI chatbots are AI language models that can help users students to expand their knowledge, improve their academic performance and improve your writing skills.

Eligibility

ChatGPT and AI chatbots can be used by college students and university staff members for educational purposes as a tool for investigation.

Guidelines

- ChatGPT and AI chatbots can be used to ask questions and get feedback. information on relevant topics related to any course academic. Research
- ChatGPT and AI chatbots should not be used to complete tasks or work of the course on behalf of the student or used in replacement
- ChatGPT and chatbots AI should not use cheat, plagiarize, or participate in any form of academic misconduct.
- Students and staff members should use their own judgment when trusting in ChatGPT and AI chatbots, as they are AI language models and not a substitute from professional advice or human interaction.
- Students and staff members must cite/reference any information obtained from

ChatGPT and AI chatbots appropriately in their work. As with all research tools, the integrity of the information should always be considered, and the student should evaluate its robustness and validity when used in conjunction with other sources.

Support

The university will provide support and resources to students and staff to use ChatGPT and AI chatbots appropriately and effectively in your learning and teaching. This includes guidance on using ChatGPT and AI chatbots, as well as promoting the academic integrity and proper citation practices.

Review:

This policy will be reviewed periodically to ensure it remains up to date.

and relevant to the needs of students and staff members who

They use ChatGPT and artificial intelligence chatbots at the university.

Please refer to the JCQ guidelines for further assistance regarding this policy: [Use](#)

[AI in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications](#) nes

**Professional development
continuous for staff**

Dō University recognizes the importance of continuing professional development of skills and knowledge of staff to achieve high standards of evaluation. Therefore, Dō University is interested in training and development of all staff from their first day on the job.

All staff receive a comprehensive induction to support the Assurance processes Internal Quality. Dō University also ensures that all staff have with the necessary qualifications and experience to perform their duties according to our quality standards.

Training and development are ongoing throughout the year. Staff Participate in standardization sessions and receive development opportunities continuous.

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

The Negligence and Mismanagement Policy is updated and communicated to the entire staff. Continuous training and development is provided to teams so that can effectively communicate all Assessment Policies to students and apprentices.

Share the evaluation policy

The socialization of the Evaluation Policy is carried out at the beginning of the academic year with all Curricular Teams.

It is also freely available to all students and apprentices from the school intranet. Staff ensure that students and apprentices know the necessary policies according to their needs.