



## Policies and Procedures

Operations Department

### **Internal Verification Process for Assignments and Examinations**

<b>Policy Author</b>	Diana Busuttil	<b>Designation</b>	Head of Institution
<b>Policy Reviewer</b>	Rosanne Galea	<b>Designation</b>	Managing Director
<b>Policy Approver</b>	QAC	<b>Revised Date</b>	26/07/2024

## Purpose

This document outlines the internal verification process to ensure the integrity, consistency, and quality of assignments and examinations at Future Focus Further and Higher Education Institution. It establishes a structured approach to preparing, delivering, marking, and reviewing student assessments.

### 1. Policy Statement

The institution is committed to maintaining academic standards by implementing a transparent and rigorous internal verification process. This process ensures fairness, consistency, and alignment with learning outcomes and institutional policies.

### 2. Scope

This policy applies to:

- a. All academic staff involved in the preparation, delivery, and marking of assignments and examinations.
- b. All courses and programs offered by the institution.
- c. All forms of assessment (written assignments, online exams, practical assessments, etc.).

## Internal Verification Procedure

### Pre-Assignment/Exam Preparation

#### **1. Assignment/Exam Design**

- a. Lecturers design assignments and exams based on course learning outcomes, institutional guidelines, and accreditation standards.
- b. Assessments must include clear instructions, grading criteria, and appropriate weightage for each section.

#### **2. Internal Review of Assessments**

- a. Drafts of assignments and exams are submitted to the internal verifier (a senior lecturer or program coordinator appointed by the Director of the Institution upon recommendation of the Head of Institution).
- b. The verifier checks for:
  - Alignment with learning outcomes and curriculum.
  - Clarity and fairness of instructions.
  - Relevance to the level of study and credit weightage.
  - Prevention of bias and cultural insensitivity.
  - Compliance with institutional and accrediting body standards.
  - Feedback is provided to the lecturer for revisions if required.

---

## Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures

### **3. Approval Process**

- a. Once verified, the assignment or exam is approved by the Head of Institution.
- b. Finalized assessments are securely stored until the scheduled distribution to students.

## **3. Distribution to Students**

### **1. Timely Communication**

- a. Assignments and exam schedules are communicated to students at the start of the program. Students are given an assessment plan, and the mode of assessment is explained and clarified.
- b. For courses at level 6 and higher, rubrics, marking schemes, and submission guidelines are shared with students alongside the assessment.

### **2. Verification of Clarity**

- a. The Head of Institution together with lecturers hold induction sessions at the start of every program and provide Q&A opportunities to address potential student queries.

## 4. Submission of Assignments/Exams by Students

### 1. Submission Guidelines

- a. Students submit assessments through the institutional platforms (LMS).
- b. The LMS is set automatically so that it closes upon the deadline.
- c. Submissions are tracked to ensure compliance with deadlines and to check for non-submissions.
- d. Specific rules apply for cases of late submissions.

### 2. Plagiarism Check

- a. Assignments are screened using plagiarism detection tools.
- b. Reports are reviewed, and instances of academic misconduct are flagged and managed as per institutional policy.

## 5. Marking and Internal Verification of Marks

### 1. Marking by Lecturer

Lecturers mark assignments/exams according to the pre-approved rubrics and marking schemes.

### 2. Internal Verification of Marks

- a. A sample of marked scripts (minimum 10-20%, or more if issues are identified) is reviewed by a second marker/verifier.
- b. The verifier checks for consistency, adherence to the marking scheme, and fairness.

---

## Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures

- c. Any discrepancies or inconsistencies are discussed with the lecturer, and marks are adjusted if necessary.

### **3. Grade Moderation**

Moderation meetings are conducted to review grade distributions and ensure alignment with institutional policies.

## 6. Post-Marking Procedures

### **1. Feedback to Students**

- a. Marked assignments/exams are returned to students with constructive feedback.
- b. Feedback highlights strengths, areas for improvement, and alignment with the grading rubric.

### **2. Appeals Process**

- a. Students are informed of the process to appeal their grades if they believe there is an error or unfair treatment.
- b. Appeals are reviewed by an independent panel or committee.

### **3. Archiving**

All marked scripts, feedback, and plagiarism reports are archived for a specified retention period as per institutional policy.

---

Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures

**4. Review and Reporting**

- a. The internal verification process is reviewed annually, and findings are reported to the Academic Quality Assurance Committee.
- b. Recommendations for improvements are implemented for subsequent academic years.

## 4. Roles and Responsibilities

### 1. Lecturers

- a. Design, mark, and provide feedback on assessments.
- b. Ensure timely submission of drafts and grades for verification.

### 2. Internal Verifiers

- a. Review assignments/exams and sample-marked scripts.
- b. Provide constructive feedback to lecturers.

### 3. Head of Institution and Program Coordinators

- a. Oversee and approve assessments.
- b. Ensure adherence to policies and resolve discrepancies.

#### 4. Academic Quality Assurance Committee

Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the internal verification process.

#### 5. Compliance and Review

- a. This policy will be reviewed every two years or as required by changes in academic or institutional standards.
- b. Non-compliance with the internal verification process will result in corrective actions as determined by the institution.