



Running Deer Assessment Policies

Specific to ASDAN Qualifications and Awards

Reviewed: 27.03.2019 | Next date for review: 01.02.2020

Contents:

- Access to Fair Assessment Policy
- Equality Statement
- Withdrawal Statement
- Candidate Malpractice Policy
- Staff Malpractice Policy
- Student Appeals Policy
- Conflicts of Interest Statement
- Running Deer Organisation Chart
- Staff Recruitment, Induction and Development Statement
- Partnership Working Statement
- Internal Moderation Policy
- Review and Feedback Statement

Appendix:

- Templates for Internal Moderation
- Templates for Staff and Student Qualification Review



Access to Fair Assessment Policy

Statement of Assessment

We aim to provide a variety of qualifications which provide all students with the opportunity to achieve their full potential by the most appropriate and direct route.

Our Assessment Policy is based on the concepts of equality, diversity, clarity, consistency and openness.

We will endeavour to ensure that the assessment processes are implemented in a way which is fair and non-discriminatory.

Access

Students are made aware of the existence of this policy and have open access to it. It can be found online at <https://www.runningdeerschool.org.uk/about/policies-and-procedures>

All staff are made aware of the contents and purpose of this policy.

This policy is reviewed annually and may be revised in response to feedback from students, staff and external organisations.

What students can expect from us:

- We aim to ensure that all assessment of work is carried out fairly and in keeping with the awarding body's requirements.
- All portfolio-based work will be assessed fairly against the qualification standards and teachers involved will be fully trained.
- Internal assessments will be carried out fairly and according to awarding body instructions.
- Externally marked tests and exams will be according to the requirements of the awarding body.

Students can also expect:

- To be fully inducted onto a new course and given information that can be shared with parents and carers.
- Learning outcomes, performance criteria and other significant elements of learning and assessment to be made clear at the outset of the course and when assignments are set.



- To be given appropriate assessment opportunities during the course with feedback provided on the quality of the work.
- All work to be marked within two weeks of submission by the student.

Where equivalents and exemptions can be applied, we will ensure this is pursued with the relevant awarding body.

Cheating and Plagiarism

A fair assessment of student's work can only be made if that work is entirely the student's own.

Therefore, students can expect an awarding body to be informed if:

- They are found guilty of copying, giving or sharing information or answers, unless part of a joint project
- They use an unauthorised aid during a test or examination
- They copy another student's answers during a test or examination
- They talk during a test or examination.

All allegations of cheating and plagiarism will lead to a full investigation which will follow the guidance of the relevant awarding body.

If a student feels he/she has been wrongly accused of cheating or plagiarism, they should be referred to the Internal Appeals Procedures Policy.

Access Arrangement: Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration

A candidate's access arrangements requirement will be determined by the Education Manager / SENCO and the Education Psychologist.

The exams officer is responsible for:

- Ensuring there is appropriate evidence for access arrangements
- Submitting access arrangement applications to the awarding bodies
- Rooming for candidates with access arrangements
- Organising invigilation and support for access arrangements

Running Deer School will adhere to the ASDAN guidance for access arrangements.



Equality Statement

Running Deer School promotes equality of opportunity for and between diverse members of the school community, including, disabled pupils, staff, parents, women, men and different racial groups within the school.

In order to do this, the School establishes with all staff an overall vision of the duty to promote equality of opportunity for pupils, staff and parents. We ensure that we will:

- Eliminate discrimination and harassment on the grounds of
 - a) sex
 - b) race
 - c) disability
 - d) religion or belief
 - e) sexual orientation
 - f) gender reassignment,
 - g) pregnancy or maternity
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it
- Foster good relations across all characteristics - between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.
- Promote positive attitudes towards disabled people.
- Encourage participation of disabled pupils, parents, staff and carers.

For further details, please refer to the Running Deer Equality Policy.

Withdrawal Statement

Reasons for withdrawing a qualification

There are a number of reasons why a qualification might be withdrawn by Running Deer School, including:

- lack of demand for the qualification



- qualification no longer meets the needs of the student population
- qualification subject matter is no longer relevant
- units and qualifications are owned by other awarding organisations who have decided to withdraw.
- lack of funding

Running Deer School qualification withdrawal process

Stage 1 – Decision to withdraw

All current Running Deer School qualifications will be reviewed by the person designated as having responsibility for Accreditation, annually or more frequently if the situation requires.

They will consider entry data, attainment levels, qualification relevance and regulatory changes.

In the event that a decision is made to withdraw a qualification a report outlining the rationale will be developed and signed off by the Head of School.

Stage 2 – Managing the Withdrawal

Upon the decision being made to withdraw a qualification, a withdrawal plan will be formulated.

The plan will comply with any requirements as stated by Ofqual and may include arrangements for learners to complete programmes of work at an alternative centre.

The plan will:

- specify how the interests of learners in relation to the qualification will be protected.
- detail how the withdrawal will be communicated to the awarding organisation, regulatory authorities, centres and learners providing details of all deadlines including the last date for accepting entries and the last date for certification.

Candidate Malpractice Policy

Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding candidate malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications and regarding examinations marked externally.



Examples of Candidate Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism: the copying and passing of as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as the candidate's only
- Failing to abide by the instructions of an assessor – This may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use
- The alteration of any results document

If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice, the candidate will be informed, and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made. If the candidate accepts that malpractice has occurred, he/she will be given the opportunity to repeat the assignment. If found guilty of malpractice following an investigation, the teacher may decide to re-mark previous assignments and these could also be rejected if similar concerns are identified.

If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice during an examination, the candidate will be informed, and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made. If the candidate is found guilty of malpractice, the Awarding Body will be informed and the candidate's examination paper will be withdrawn. It is unlikely that the candidate will have the opportunity to repeat the examination.

Appeals

If a malpractice decision is made, which the candidate feels is unfair, the candidate has the right to appeal in line with the Student Appeals Policy.

Staff Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications and also regarding examinations invigilated by staff at the school and marked externally. This also covers maladministration.



Examples of Staff Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Tampering with candidates work prior to external moderation/verification
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regard to examinations:

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

Staff Malpractice Procedure

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the Head of School, who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out within ten working days. The person responsible for coordinating the investigation will depend on the qualification being investigated. The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the staff member concerned and any potential witnesses will be interviewed and their version of events recorded on paper.

The member of staff will be:

- informed in writing of the allegation made against him or her informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him/her
- informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shared with the relevant awarding body and may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators Ofqual, the police and/or professional bodies



If work is submitted for moderation/verification or for marking which is not the candidate's own work, the awarding body may not be able to give that candidate a result.

Staff Malpractice Sanctions

Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, Running Deer may impose the following sanctions:

Written warning: Issue the member of staff with a written warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied

Training: Require the member of staff, as a condition of future involvement in both internal and external assessments to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period of time, including a review process at the end of the training

Special conditions: Impose special conditions on the future involvement in assessments by the member of staff

Suspension: Bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration of assessments for a set period of time

Dismissal: Should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct; the member of staff could face dismissal from his/her post

Appeals

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be conducted in line with the organisations Appeals Policy.

Maladministration

According to ASDAN, maladministration is any unintentional activity or practice that leads to non-compliance with ASDAN requirements. In most cases, maladministration will relate to administrative or quality assurance procedures, and may involve any or all of the following: candidates, centre staff, awarding organisation staff.

To mitigate against errors in administration, or maladministration, the entry record will be created by the exams officer and checked by the Education Manager before and after entry of candidates to any specified award.

Examples of maladministration:

- Incorrect registering of units



- Incorrect candidate names

In the event of an error occurring, the awarding body will be notified immediately.

Student Appeals Policy

Introduction

This policy addresses the situation where students may wish to appeal against a grade he/she has received for a qualification.

Access

Students are made aware of the existence of this policy and have open access to it. It can be found online at: <https://www.runningdeerschool.org.uk/about/policies-and-procedures> . All staff are made aware of this policy and how to access it in order that students can be supported. This policy is reviewed annually and may be amended in response to feedback from students, staff, parents and external organisations.

Policy Statement

All students at Running Deer have the right to make an appeal about any of the marks received for the qualifications they are undertaking. If any student wishes to appeal a decision, they should follow the following procedure within 10 working days of receiving the disputed decision.

- If possible, speak to the member of staff responsible for teaching the qualification in the first instance about the reason they wish to appeal.
- The member of staff has a responsibility to explain to the candidate why he/she received the grade/mark.
- If the student is not satisfied with the explanation, the piece of work will be re-marked by another member of staff also involved with that qualification.
- The student will be informed of the outcome of the re-marking by letter within 2 weeks of their original appeal.

If the student wants to continue the appeal, he/she needs to contact the exams officer, who will provide the student with information about the appeals procedure for the relevant awarding body and explain what is involved.

The exams officer will assist with the completion of any forms and will correspond with the awarding body on behalf of the student.



Please note: a student must have the support of the centre to be able to appeal against a result.

Conflicts of Interest Statement

A conflict of interest in this context can be defined as a situation that has the potential to undermine the impartiality of a tutor, assessor, and internal moderator because of a person's self-interest, professional interest or public interest.


ASDAN is required under its Conditions of Recognition to be aware of any potential conflicts of interest that may impact on the outcomes of internal assessment and ultimately the award of a qualification.

All staff will be made aware of the following examples of potential conflicts of interest, though this list is not exhaustive:

- A member of staff works for a centre and a family member takes a qualification at the same centre
- A member of staff at the centre is completing a qualification delivered and assessed by the centre
- Tutor, assessor or internal moderator working with more than one centre or private training provider
- Tutor, assessor or internal moderator partaking in the appointment, promotion, supervision or evaluation of a person with whom they have family connections with
- A member of centre staff involved in the delivery or outcome of an ASDAN qualification having a family connection with an ASDAN registered learner or learner's family

If aware of a conflict of interest, or the potential for there to be one, staff must make this known as soon as possible to the Head of School or Education Manager. This will be dealt with on an individual basis, seeking to remove the conflict of interest and to ensure fair assessment for all candidates.

Running Deer Organisation Chart



Staff Recruitment, Induction and Development Statement

Running Deer is a small provision with only 4 full time students on roll. Due to our small size, we will be working closely with Brook Green Centre for Learning to share expertise and to jointly carry out internal moderation.

Staff at Running Deer responsible for leading ASDAN qualifications will have had the appropriate training, will engage with regional meetings, and will keep their training up to date. Other staff teaching on the courses will receive cascade training from the ASDAN Coordinator.

Partnership Working Statement

Running Deer School will be working alongside Brook Green Centre for Learning, Plymouth, to ensure fair internal moderation procedures, due to the small number of candidates at Running Deer. The internal moderation processes will be followed jointly by both centres, moderating across cohorts, following the timelines detailed later in this document.



The organisation, delivery, and assessment of ASDAN programmes and qualifications will remain the individual responsibility of the candidates' on-roll school. Staff with responsibility for coordinating ASDAN programmes at each school may attend meetings jointly, for example with the regional lead, or will report back to the other school if only one representative is in attendance.

Internal Moderation Policy

Internal moderation is a key process carried out by centres, throughout the delivery of a Qualification, to ensure that assessment methods are consistent across all Tutors/Assessors and that outcomes are fair to all students.

Evidence of a robust internal moderation system will be required at external moderation and for audit purposes; therefore there must be reliable and auditable record-keeping systems in place.

It is the responsibility of all staff to participate in the moderation process by keeping the necessary records, attending relevant meetings and submitting marked candidate work as requested.

All assessment evidence that has been internally moderated must be kept on site until after the external moderation. The work remains the property of the candidate and can be returned to the candidate according to the requirements of the relevant awarding organisation.

The aim of this policy is to ensure that:

- internal moderation practices are valid and reliable, cover all tutors/assessors and meet the requirements of the awarding organisation
- the internal moderation procedures are fair and open
- accurate and detailed records are kept of internal moderation decisions

The centre will:

- ensure that all assessment activities are valid, appropriate and fit for purpose
- apply a strategy that will provide a representative sample across all tutor/assessors create a plan of internal moderation in relation to all assessment activities
- define, maintain and support effective internal moderation roles, including the provision of training where required
- provide standardised documentation to support internal moderation activity and record-keeping



- ensure that feedback and outcomes of internal and external moderation support future development of good practice
- carry out an annual evaluation and review of internal moderation policy and procedures

Due to the small numbers of students at Running Deer, we will partner with Brook Green Centre for Learning, Plymouth, for internal moderation. They have been running ASDAN courses for a number of years and already have robust systems in place. We will replicate this robustness at Running Deer, with Brook Green also acting as critical friends.

Internal Moderation Process for Centres

First 6 weeks of term

- Establish numbers of student cohort
- Establish levels that these candidates will work on
- Register candidates (ASDAN Website)

Term 1b

- First round of formative internal moderation to be conducted with colleagues from Brook Green Centre for Learning.
- All student work will be moderated if numbers < 5.
- One copy of feedback sheet to be given to the assessor, one to be stored centrally in the centre portfolio for auditable purposes
- Meeting held to discuss issues arising from first round of internal moderation. Minutes taken.

Term 2b

- Second round of formative internal moderation to be conducted. Documentation to be copied as before and stored in centre portfolio.
- Any action noted by IM on first round to be checked and signed off.
- Meeting held to discuss issues arising.

Term 3a

- Co-ordinator to establish candidates and units to be put forward for external moderation (as required)
- Summative internal moderation to be conducted
- Arrangements to be made for External Moderation



Review and Feedback Statement

In the first instance, feedback on ongoing and completed work will be given to students as part of regular formative assessment as they progress through the relevant ASDAN award at Running Deer.

Following each round of internal moderation with Brook Green Centre for Learning, a review meeting will be held, and feedback will be given to tutors and assessors, and to candidates where necessary.

After external moderation has taken place, a review meeting will be held. Feedback will be given to tutors and assessors and an action plan will be put in place to further develop practice and address any issues arising. This will be communicated and agreed between both centres.

At the end of each academic year, a curriculum review will be held involving staff and students. Responses will be gathered via questionnaire and used to continually improve standards and outcomes. See Appendix for templates.

Contact Running Deer

Running Deer CIC, Butterdon Wood, Moretonhampstead, Exeter TQ13 8PY

Telephone: 01647 400201 | Email: info@runningdeer.org.uk

Website: <https://www.runningdeer.org.uk>

Appendix:

Minutes from Internal Moderation Meeting



Persons present:	Date:
Issues arising:	Action agreed / person(s) responsible
Date agreed for next meeting:	

Feedback to Assessor Sheet



Candidate name:		Date:
Assessor name:		
Moderator name:		
Qualification title:		
Unit(s) moderated:		
Comments / feedback on how assessment / evidence meets the standards:		
Comments / feedback on completion of mandatory paperwork:		
Assessor signature		Date:
Internal Moderator signature:		
Date agreed for any action identified by:		
Internal Moderator signature to confirm action completed:		

Student Qualification Review Form



Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
My tutor explained what I needed to do to get the ASDAN qualification?					
I was given enough help to complete your evidence?					
I had regular time each week to complete ASDAN work?					
I received individual support					
I knew when your tutor was assessing your work?					
My tutor let me know how I was doing?					

What do you think has gone well in terms of your ASDAN course this year?

What do you think could have gone better, and how?

Staff Qualification Review Form

Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements:



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I was given adequate induction into the qualification and my role as a tutor					
I was given regular time in the week to work with students on their ASDAN programme					
I understood what support I should be giving to students					
I was able to ask for help if I was unsure of anything					
I knew when work was going to be moderated and understood what this process entailed					

What do you think has gone well in terms of ASDAN this year?

What areas do you think could be improved, and how?