

Non-examination Assessment (including controlled assessment and coursework) Policy

Upton Hall School FCJ

Centre Number:24763

Approved by: Curriculum committee

Reviewed by: Anne Murphy

Date: July 2025

Key staff involved in the policy

- **Head of Centre: Andrea Gaunt**
- **Curriculum Deputy: Anne Murphy**
- **Exams Officer: Helen Whitehurst**
- **IV Lead: Laura Griffiths**
- **Senco: Paula Etheridge**

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that non-examination assessment at Upton Hall School FCJ are planned for and managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to NEA and ICC refer to the JCQ documents [Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments](#) and [Instructions for conducting coursework](#).

Introduction

Non-examination assessments measure subject-specific knowledge and skills that cannot be tested by timed written papers.

There are three assessment stages and rules which apply to each stage. These rules often vary across subjects. The stages are:

- task setting
- task taking

- task marking

The regulator's definition of an examination is very narrow. In effect, any type of assessment that is not 'externally set and taken by candidates at the same time under controlled conditions' is classified as non-examination assessment (NEA). 'NEA' therefore includes, but is not limited to, internal assessment. Externally marked and/or externally set practical examinations taken at different times across centres are classified as 'NEA'.

Coursework components assess candidates' skills, knowledge and understanding that may not readily be assessed by timed written papers. Coursework will take many different forms. (ICC 1)

The term coursework is a generic one. It includes the work required in Project qualifications and internally assessed work in other qualifications covered by these Instructions. These instructions are for use in AQA Applied General qualifications, OCR Cambridge Nationals, CCEA GCE unitised AS and A-level qualifications, ELC and Project qualifications. They may also apply to other awarding body-specific Level 1, Level 2 or Level 3 qualifications. Centres should refer to awarding body instructions. (ICC Introduction, Foreword)

Purpose of the policy

This policy confirms the JCQ requirement that Upton Hall School FCJ has in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework.

Awarding bodies require centres to have a non-examination assessment policy in place to:

- cover procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments
- define staff roles and responsibilities with respect to non-examination assessments
- manage risks associated with non-examination assessments (NEA 1)

Procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessment identifying staff roles and responsibilities

Where reference is made in these procedures to non-examination assessment, this is intended to include GCE and GCSE specifications with one or more non-examination assessment component, controlled assessment (where applicable) and coursework.

1. The basic principles

The Head of centre will

Return a declaration (managed as part of the National Centre Number Register annual update) to confirm awareness of, and that relevant centre staff are adhering to, the latest version of **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments** and **Instructions for conducting coursework**

- ensure all reasonable steps have been or will be taken to ensure that all candidates at the centre have had, or will have, the opportunity to undertake the (GCSE English Language) Spoken Language endorsement
- ensure all reasonable steps have been or will be taken to ensure that all candidates at the centre have had, or will have, the opportunity to undertake the (A Level Sciences) prescribed practical activities
- Ensures the centre's policy is fit for purpose and covers all types of non-examination assessment
- Ensures the centre's **internal appeals procedure** clearly details the process to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks) and requesting a review of the centre's marking

The Curriculum Deputy will

- Ensure the correct conduct of non-examination assessment (including endorsements) which comply with the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments, Instructions for conducting coursework** and awarding body subject-specific instructions
- Ensure the centre-wide calendar records assessment schedules by the start of the academic year
- Ensure appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture/record relevant information given to candidates by subject teachers
- Ensure appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture/record relevant information is received and understood by candidates
- Where not provided by the awarding body, ensure a centre-devised template is provided for candidates to keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc.
- Ensure appropriate procedures are in place to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers in line with awarding body criteria

The Lead internal verifier will

- Confirm with BTEC verifiers that appropriate awarding body forms and templates for non-examination assessment (including endorsements) are used by teachers and candidates
- Ensure appropriate procedures are in place to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers in line with awarding body criteria

Heads of Faculty and Subject Leaders will:

- Ensure subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities within the non-examination assessment process

- Ensure the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments**, **Instructions for conducting coursework** and relevant awarding body subject specific instructions are followed in relation to the conduct of non-examination assessment (including endorsements)
- Work with the QA lead/Lead internal verifier (or equivalent role) to ensure appropriate procedures are followed to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers

Teachers of subjects with NEA and coursework will

- Understand and comply with the general instructions as detailed in the JCQ documents [Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments](#) and [Instructions for conducting coursework](#)
- Where these may also be provided by the awarding body, understand and comply with the awarding body's specification for conducting non-examination assessments and coursework, including any subject-specific instructions, teachers' notes or additional information on the awarding body's website
- Mark internally assessed work to the criteria provided by the awarding body
- Ensure the exams officer is provided with relevant entry codes for subjects (whether the entry for the internally assessed component forms part of the overall entry code for the qualification or is made as a separate unit entry code) to the internal deadline for entries for the relevant exam series

The **exams officer** will

- Signpost the annually updated JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments** and **Instructions for conducting coursework** to relevant centre staff
- Carry out tasks where these may be applicable to the role in supporting the administration/management of non-examination assessments and coursework

2. Task setting

The **subject teacher** will

- Select tasks to be undertaken where a number of comparable tasks are provided by the awarding body or designs tasks where this is permitted by criteria set out within the subject specification
- Make candidates aware of the criteria used to assess their work

Issuing of tasks

The **subject teacher** will

- Determine when set tasks are issued by the awarding body

- Identify date(s) when tasks should be taken by candidates
- Access set tasks in sufficient time to allow planning, resourcing and teaching and ensures that materials are stored securely at all times

3. Task taking

Supervision

The **subject teacher** will

- Check the awarding body's subject-specific requirements ensuring candidates take tasks under the required conditions and supervision arrangements
- Ensure there is sufficient supervision to enable the work of a candidate to be authenticated
- Ensure there is sufficient supervision to ensure the work a candidate submits is their own
- To ensure that where work may be completed outside of the centre without direct supervision, that the work produced is the candidate's own
- Where candidates may work in groups, keep a record of each candidate's contribution and it must be possible to attribute assessable outcomes to individual candidates
- Ensure candidates are aware of the current JCQ [documents Information for candidates - non-examination assessments and Information for candidates - Social media](#)
- Ensure candidates are aware of the Centre's policy on AI and malpractice by sharing the relevant policy and the appendix on AI
- Ensure candidates understand and comply with the regulations in relevant JCQ **Information for candidates** documents
- Ensure candidates:
 - understand that information from all sources must be referenced
 - receive guidance on setting out references
 - are aware that they must not plagiarise other material

Advice and feedback

The **subject teacher** will

- As relevant to the subject/component, advise candidates on relevant aspects before candidates begin working on a task
- Will **not** provide candidates with model answers or writing frames specific to the task
- When reviewing candidates' work, unless prohibited by the specification, provide oral and written advice at a general level to candidates
- Allow candidates to revise and re-draft work after advice has been given at a general level

- Record any assistance given beyond general advice and take it into account in the marking or submits it to the external examiner
- When marking work, teachers will use annotations to explain how marks were applied in the context of the additional assistance given
- Ensure when work has been **handed in for final assessment**, candidates are not allowed to revise it or allowed access to it.
- Teachers will not provisionally assess work and then allow candidates to revise it
- Explicitly prohibited assistance will not be given
- Failure to follow this procedure constitutes malpractice

Resources

The **subject teacher** will

- Refer to the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation to determine if candidates have restricted/unrestricted access to resources when planning and researching their tasks

Refer to the JCQ document [AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice) (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice) as well as the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation published by the awarding bodies and the regulator

- By referencing this document and the centre's malpractice policy, makes candidates aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment
- Ensure conditions for any formally supervised sessions are known and put in place
- Ensure appropriate arrangements are in place to keep the work to be assessed, and any preparatory work, secure between any formally supervised sessions, including work that is stored electronically
- Ensure conditions for any formally supervised sessions are understood and followed by candidates
- Ensure candidates understand that they are not allowed to introduce improved notes or new resources between formally supervised sessions
- Ensure that where appropriate to include references, candidates keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources, etc.

Word and time limits

The **subject teacher** will

- Refer to the awarding body's specification to determine where word and time limits apply/are mandatory

Collaboration and group work

The **subject teacher** will

- Unless stated otherwise in the awarding body's specification, and where appropriate, allow candidates to collaborate when carrying out research and preparatory work
- Ensure that it is possible to attribute assessable outcomes to individual candidates
- Ensure that where an assignment requires written work to be produced, each candidate writes up their own account of the assignment
- Assess the work of each candidate individually

Authentication procedures

The **subject teacher** will

Where required by the awarding body's specification:

- ensure candidates sign a declaration confirming the work they submit for final assessment is their own unaided work
- sign the teacher declaration of authentication confirming the requirements have been met
- Keep signed candidate declarations on file until the deadline for requesting reviews of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later
- Provide signed candidate declarations where these may be requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector (Electronic signatures are acceptable)
- Where there may be doubt about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or if malpractice is suspected, follow the authentication procedures and malpractice information in the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments** and/or **Instructions for conducting coursework** and inform a member of the senior leadership team
- Understand that if, during the external moderation process, it is found that the work has not been properly authenticated, the awarding body will set the mark(s) awarded by the centre to zero

Presentation of work

The **subject teacher** will

- Obtain informed consent at the beginning of the course from parents/carers if videos or photographs/images of candidates will be included as evidence of participation or contribution
- Instruct candidates to present work as detailed in the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments/coursework** unless the awarding body's specification gives different subject-specific instructions

- Instruct candidates to add their candidate number, centre number and the component code of the assessment as a header/footer on each page of their work
- Ensures if candidates' work is to be submitted electronically, that it meets the awarding body's specified requirements

Keeping materials secure

The **subject teacher** will

- When work is being undertaken by candidates under formal supervision, ensure work is securely stored between sessions (if more than one session)
- When work is submitted by candidates for final assessment, ensure work is securely stored
- Follow secure storage instructions as defined in the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments/coursework**
- Take sensible precautions when work is taken home for marking
- Store internally assessed work, including the sample returned after awarding body moderation, securely until all possible post-results services have been exhausted
- If post-results services have not been requested, return internally assessed work to candidates (if requested by a candidate) after the deadline for requesting a review of results for the relevant series
- If post-results services have been requested, return internally assessed work to candidates (if requested by a candidate) once the review of results and any subsequent appeal has been completed
- Remind candidates of the need to keep their own work secure at all times and not share completed or partially completed work on-line, on social media or through any other means (Remind candidates of the contents of the JCQ [document Information for candidates - social media](#))
 - Where work is stored electronically, liaise with IT to ensure the protection and back-up of candidates' work and that appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access to it between sessions
- Understands that during the period from the submission of work for formal assessment until the deadline for requesting a review of results, copies of work may be used for other purposes, provided that the originals are stored securely as required

IT role and responsibilities:

- Ensure appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access between sessions to candidates' work where work is stored electronically
- Restrict access to this material and utilises appropriate security safeguards such as firewall protection and virus scanning software
- Employ an effective back-up strategy so that an up to date archive of candidates' evidence is maintained

- Consider the contingency of candidates' work being backed-up on two separate devices, including one off-site back-up and implementing appropriate security arrangements which protect candidates' work in the event of IT system corruption and cyber-attacks
- Consider encrypting any sensitive digital media to ensure the security of the data stored within it and refers to awarding body guidance to ensure that the method of encryption is suitable

4. Task marking - externally assessed components

Conduct of externally assessed work

The subject teacher will

- Liaise with the exams officer regarding the arrangements for any externally assessed components of a specification which must be conducted within a window of dates specified by the awarding body and where applicable, according to the JCQ document **Instructions for conducting examinations**
- Liaise with the Visiting Examiner where this may be applicable to any externally assessed component

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Arrange timetabling, rooming and invigilation where and if this is applicable to any externally assessed non-examination component of a specification
- Conduct the externally assessed component within the window specified by the awarding body and where applicable, according to JCQ document [Instructions for conducting examinations](#)

Submission of work

The Subject teacher will

- Pays close attention to the completion of the attendance register, if applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Provide the attendance register to the subject teacher where applicable
- Ensure the awarding body's attendance register for any externally assessed component is completed correctly
- Where candidates' work must be despatched to an awarding body's examiner or uploaded electronically, ensures this is completed by the date specified by the awarding body
- Keep a copy of the attendance register until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series
- Package the work as required by the awarding body and attaches the examiner address label
- Ensure that the package in which the work is despatched is robust and securely fastened

- Despatch the work to the awarding body's instructions by the required deadline

5. Task marking - internally assessed components

Marking and annotation

The Head of centre

- Makes every effort to avoid situations where a candidate is assessed by a person who has a close personal relationship with the candidate, for example, members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g son/daughter)
- Where this cannot be avoided, ensures the possible conflict of interest is declared to the relevant awarding body and the marked work is submitted for moderation whether or not it is part of the moderation sample

The Subject Lead will

- Set timescales for teachers to inform candidates of their centre-assessed marks that will allow sufficient time for a candidate to appeal an internal assessment decision/request a review of the centre's marking prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body external deadline

The Subject teacher will

- Attend/access awarding body training/updates as required to ensure familiarity with the mark scheme/marketing process
- Mark candidates' work in accordance with the marking criteria provided by the awarding body
(Does not use artificial intelligence as the sole means of marking candidates' work)
- Annotate candidates' work as required to facilitate internal standardisation of marking and enable external moderation to check that marking is in line with the assessment criteria
- Inform candidates of their marks which could be subject to change by the awarding body moderation process
- Ensure candidates are informed of the timescale set by the subject lead or as indicated in the centre's internal appeals procedure to enable an internal appeal/request for a review of marking to be submitted by a candidate and the outcome known before final marks are submitted to the awarding body

Internal standardisation

The Lead Internal Verifier will

- Ensure that internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place as required and to sequence

- Support staff not familiar with the mark scheme (e.g. ECTs, supply staff etc.)
- Ensure accurate internal standardisation - for example by:
 - obtaining reference materials at an early stage in the course
 - holding a preliminary trial marking session prior to marking
 - carrying out further trial marking at appropriate points during the marking period
 - after most marking has been completed, holds a further meeting to make final adjustments
 - making final adjustments to marks prior to submission retaining work and evidence of standardisation
- Retain evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out

The **subject teacher** will

- Indicate on work (or cover sheet) the date of marking
- Mark to common standards
- Keep candidates work secure until after the closing date for review of results for the series concerned or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later

Submission of marks and work for moderation

The **Subject teacher** will

- Input and submit marks online, via the awarding body secure extranet site, keeping a record of the marks awarded, to the external deadline/Provides marks to the exams officer to the internal deadline
- Where responsible for marks input, ensure checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensures mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors
- Submit the requested samples of candidates' work to the awarding body moderator by the external deadline, keeping a record of the work submitted/Provides the moderation sample to the exams officer to the internal deadline
- Ensure that where a candidate's work has been facilitated by a scribe or practical assistant, the relevant completed cover sheet is securely attached to the front of the work and sent to the moderator in addition to the sample requested
- Ensure the moderator is provided with authentication of candidates' work, confirmation that internal standardisation has been undertaken and any other subject-specific information where this may be required

Submit any supporting documentation required by the awarding body/Provide the exams officer with any supporting documentation required by the awarding body

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Input and submit marks online, via the awarding body secure extranet site, keeping a record of the marks submitted, to the external deadline/Confirm with subject teachers that marks have been submitted to the awarding body deadline
- Where responsible for marks input, ensure checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensure mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors
- Submits the requested samples of candidates' work to the moderator by the awarding body deadline, keeping a record of the work submitted/Confirms with subject teacher that the moderation sample has been submitted to the awarding body deadline

Ensure that for postal moderation:

- work is dispatched in packaging provided by the awarding body
- moderator label(s) provided by the awarding body are affixed to the packaging
- proof of dispatch is obtained and kept on file until the successful issue of final results
- Through the subject teacher, ensures the moderator is provided with authentication of candidates' work, confirmation that internal standardisation has been undertaken and any other subject-specific information where this may be required
- Through the subject teacher, submit any supporting documentation required by the awarding body

Storage and retention of work after submission of marks

The Subject teacher will

- Keep a record of names and candidate numbers for candidates whose work was included in the moderation sample
- Retain all marked candidates' work (including any sample returned after moderation) under secure conditions for the required retention period
- In liaison with IT, take steps to protect any work stored electronically from corruption and has a back-up procedure in place
- If retention is a problem because of the nature of the work, retain some form of evidence such as photos, audio or media recordings

The Exams Officer will

- Ensure any sample returned after moderation is logged and returned to the subject teacher for secure storage and required retention

External moderation - the process

The subject teacher will

- Ensure that awarding body or its moderator receive the correct samples of candidates' work
- Where relevant, liaise with the awarding body/moderator where the moderator visits the centre to mark the sample of work

Comply with any request from the moderator for remaining work or further evidence of the centre's marking

External moderation - feedback

The Subject lead will

- Check the final moderated marks when issued to the centre when the results are published
- Check any moderator reports and ensure that any remedial action, if necessary, is undertaken before the next exam series

The exams officer will

- Access or signpost any moderator reports to relevant staff
- Takes remedial action, if necessary, where feedback may relate to centre administration

6. Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

The subject teacher will

- Work with the SENCo (or equivalent role) to ensure any access arrangements for eligible candidates are applied to assessments

- **The Senco will**

- Follow the regulations and guidance in the JCQ document **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** in relation to non-examination assessment
- Where arrangements do not undermine the integrity of the qualification and is the candidate's normal way of working, ensure access arrangements are in place and awarding body approval, where required, has been obtained prior to assessments taking place
- Make subject teachers aware of any access arrangements for eligible candidates which need to be applied to assessments
- Work with subject teachers to ensure requirements for access arrangement candidates requiring the support of a facilitator in assessments are met
- Ensure that staff acting as an access arrangement facilitator are fully trained in their role

7. Special consideration and loss of work

The Subject teacher will

- Understand that a candidate may be eligible for special consideration in assessments in certain situations where a candidate is absent and/or produces a reduced quantity of work
- Liaise with the exams officer to report loss of work to the awarding body

The Exams officer will

Refer to/directs relevant staff to the JCQ document **A guide to the special consideration process**:

- Where a candidate is eligible, submits an application for special consideration via the awarding body's secure extranet site to the prescribed timescale
- Where application for special consideration via the awarding body's secure extranet site is not applicable, submits the required form to the awarding body to the prescribed timescale
- Keeps required evidence on file to support the application
- Refer to/directs relevant staff where applicable to **Form 15 - JCQ/LCW** (lost work) and where applicable submits to the relevant awarding bod

8. Malpractice

The Head of Centre

- Understands the responsibility to immediately report to the relevant awarding body any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates or centre staff
- Ensures any irregularity identified by the centre before the candidate has signed the authentication statement (where required) are dealt with under its own internal procedures, with no requirement to report the irregularity to the awarding body (The only exception being where the awarding body's confidential assessment materials has been breached, the breach must be report to the awarding body)
- Is familiar with the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**
- Ensure that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing non-examination assessments or coursework are aware of the potential for malpractice and ensure that teaching staff are reminded that failure to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself

The **subject teacher** will

- Be aware of the JCQ **Notice to Centre - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work**
- Ensure candidates understand what constitutes malpractice in non-examination assessments/coursework

- Ensure candidates understand the JCQ documents **Information for candidates - non-examination assessments/coursework assessments**
- Ensure candidates understand the JCQ document **Information for candidates - social media**
- Escalate and report any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates to the head of centre

The Exams Officer will

- Signpost the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** to the head of centre
- Signpost to relevant staff the JCQ **Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work**
- Signpost candidates to the relevant JCQ **information for candidates** documents
- Where required, support the head of centre in investigating and reporting incidents of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice

9. Post-results services

The Head of Centre will

- be familiar with the JCQ document **Post-Results Services**
- Ensure the centre's **internal appeals procedure** clearly details the process to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against a centre decision not to support an application for a review of results or an appeal

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

- Provide relevant support to subject teachers making decisions about reviews of results

The **subject teacher** will

- Provide advice and guidance to candidates on their results and the post-results services available
- Provide the exams officer with the original sample or relevant sample of candidates' work that may be required for a review of moderation to the internal deadline

The Exams Officer

- Is aware of the individual post-results services available for externally assessed and internally assessed components as detailed in the JCQ document **Post-Results Services** (Information and guidance to centres...)

Provide/signpost relevant centre staff and candidates to post-results services information

- Ensure any requests for post-results services that are available to centre-assessed work are submitted online via the awarding body secure extranet site to deadline

10. Endorsements

Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications (designed for use in England)

Head of centre role and responsibilities:

- Ensure the appropriate arrangements are in place for internal standardisation of assessments

The Subject Lead will

- Confirm understanding of the **Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications** and ensures any relevant JCQ/awarding body instructions are followed
- Ensure the required task setting and task taking instructions are followed by subject teachers
- Ensure subject teachers assess candidates, either live or from recordings, using the common assessment criteria
- Ensure for monitoring purposes, audio-visual recordings of the presentations of a sample of candidates are provided

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Ensure all the requirements in relation to the endorsement are known and understood
- Follow the required task setting and task taking instructions
- Assess candidates, either live or from recordings, using the common assessment criteria
- Provide audio-visual recordings of the presentations of a sample of candidates for monitoring purposes
- Follow the awarding body's instructions for the submission of grades (**Pass, Merit, Distinction** or **Not Classified**) and the storage and submission of recordings

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Follow the awarding body's instructions for the submission of grades and recordings

Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences (designed for use in England)

16. Practical Skills and Endorsement for the A level Sciences

Head of centre role and responsibilities:

- Ensure that any new lead teachers undertake the required Practical Endorsement training provided by the Awarding Body and have a copy of the appropriate certificate
- Ensure that the Practical Endorsement Lead Teacher (Miss Chadwick, Head of Science) and/or relevant Head of Subject (Miss Chadwick for Biology, Mrs Bailey for Chemistry and Mrs Seed for Physics) liaise with the practical moderator when a request is made to undertake a monitoring visit.

Lead internal verifier role and responsibilities:

- Miss Chadwick (Practical Endorsement Lead Teacher) will ensure that the relevant Heads of Subject (Mrs Bailey for Chemistry and Mrs Seed for Physics) are appropriately trained in the implementation of the requirements of the practical endorsement and apply the standards appropriately.
- The Practical Endorsement Lead Teacher will also ensure that the Heads of subject hold the necessary certification.

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

- Miss Chadwick (Biology), Mrs Bailey (Chemistry) and Mrs Seed (Physics) will confirm that they have an understanding of the Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences and ensure any relevant JCQ/awarding body instructions are followed
- Undertake any training provided by the awarding body on the implementation of the practical endorsement
- Disseminate information to subject teachers ensuring the standards can be applied appropriately
- Liaises with all relevant parties in relation to arrangements for and conduct of a monitoring visit
- Ensure that all A level teaching staff within their department have undertaken the relevant training provided by the awarding body and that copies of certificates are retained

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Mrs Whitehurst , the examinations officer, will ensure that where the centre intends to enter candidates for the first time for one or more of the A level subjects, the relevant awarding body will be contacted at the beginning of the course
- Accepts the request for contact from the Practical Endorsement monitoring staff and passes this information to the subject lead for a visit to be arranged with at least two weeks notice
- Liaises with lead subject teachers and follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of candidates Pass or Not Classified assessment outcome prior to the external deadline

11. Private candidates

We do not accept private candidates for examinations requiring coursework.

12. Qualification/Subject specific additional information

This section provides additional information/procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments in specific subjects or qualifications.

NA

13. Monitoring

This policy will be reviewed by the Curriculum Deputy at the beginning of each academic year. At every review, the policy will be shared with the Governing Body and approved by Curriculum Committee.

14. Links with other policies

This policy should be read in conjunction with

- the Assessment Policy
- the Exams Policy
- the UHS Review of Marking Policy

Changes 2024/2025

(Changed) Title of template (optional).

(Added) Where relevant, added reference to the JCQ document Instructions for conducting coursework.

(Added) Under heading **Introduction** added reference to coursework.

(Reworded) Under heading **Purpose of the policy** reworded the first paragraph.

(Added) Under headings **Procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessment identifying staff roles and responsibilities** and **Management of issues and potential risks associated with non-examination assessment** added a paragraph to provide clarity: Where reference is made in these procedures to non-examination assessment, this is intended to include (GCE and GCSE) non-examination assessments, controlled assessments (where relevant) and coursework.

(Added) Under heading **Keeping materials secure** (IT role and responsibilities) added a bullet point: Centres must ensure that candidates' work is backed-up and should consider the contingency of candidates' work being backed-up on two separate devices, including one off-site back-up. Centres must implement appropriate security arrangements which protect candidates' work in the event of IT system corruption and cyber-attacks.

(Added) Under heading **Task marking – internally assessed components** (Marking and annotation - Subject teacher) added to the bullet point regarding marking candidates' work: (Does not use artificial intelligence as the sole means of marking candidates' work)

The use of Artificial Intelligence(AI) in assessed work for awarding bodies

a) Key principles

The Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) has published clear guidance on the use of AI which can be found [here](#). The school will comply with this guidance.

JCQ's guidance states that any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

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.

b) Measures to inform candidates

To guard against malpractice linked to AI, the centre will:

- i) Explain to students, before they begin working on any work which forms part of an exam assessment and in which access to the internet is permitted, the importance of completing their own independent work.
- ii) Explain to students the JCQ guidance about malpractice linked to AI, found in section (a) above.
- iii) Reinforce to students the significance of their declaration where they confirm the work they are submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject
- iv) Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice
- v) Explain to students the conventions for referencing acceptable AI use.

To ensure that all students receive this information in a consistent manner, all students beginning on relevant work will be asked to read a copy of the school's 'Guidance on the use of AI' (appendix one here) and sign the declaration sheet, which will be retained by the school.

c) Measures to reduce the likelihood of AI misuse during the completion of assessed work

JCQ have suggested a number of actions which teachers can take as assessed work is being prepared, which will make it harder for candidates to misuse AI whilst completing their work. Not all of these will be appropriate or permissible in every subject, but each department completing relevant work should consider which of these approaches are valid for them, and have a written record of which of these approaches they will use as a matter of routine.

Possible approaches include:

- a) Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
- b) Ensure access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;
- c) Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;
- d) Where appropriate, allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be completed in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate all of each student's work with confidence;
- e) Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure work is underway in a planned and timely manner and work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages;
- f) Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident the student understands the material;
- g) Consider whether it is helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain they understand it and it reflects their own independent work;
- h) Do not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has 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.
- i) Issuing tasks for centre-devised assignments which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models trained using historic data

If, in the course of assessed work being completed, a teacher suspects that a student is misusing AI, they will alert their Head of Department and the Exams Officer, who will consider appropriate next steps.

d) Marking of assessed work

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

JCQ suggest a range of questions which teachers may usefully consider as they are marking which could help identify AI misuse. These can be found in the 'Identifying Misuse' section of [the JCQ guidance on AI](#). Teachers will be alert to the following signs

- a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.
- b) A default use of language or vocabulary which may not accord with the qualification level (though be aware AI tools may be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content).
- c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected (though some AI tools will produce quotations and references).
- 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) A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which may be notable for some subjects.
- f) Instances of incorrect and/or inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.
- g) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.
- h) 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 it.
- i) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected.
- j) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge

. k) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected.

l) 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.

m) The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten.

n) 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 and variety or to overcome its output limit.

o) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content.

p) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style

If a member of staff has concerns about the authenticity of work submitted by a student, they will alert their Head of Department and the Exams Officer, who will consider appropriate next steps.

Guidance on the use of AI

Key principles:

There are strict rules about the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in work which forms part of an exam course. You **must** make sure that you comply with these rules. Failure to do so may result in a severe penalty, which could include disqualification from the qualification. Guidance can be found [here](#)

The Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) states that any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

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.

You will be required to sign an authentication sheet when you complete your assessed work. This states that the work is your own, independent work. After you have signed it, any concerns about malpractice must be referred to the exam board for investigation.

Teachers have been provided with guidance about how to identify AI misuse. They may also use electronic tools to help identify AI misuse.

Referencing AI use:

If you make any use of AI, you must reference it, as you would any other source.

- i) To reference the use of an AI tool, you must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2023.
- j) You must 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 work so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used

If you use an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified and referenced in your work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, you should ensure that you independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources you have used to do this.

I have read and understood this guidance. I understand that any misuse of AI may lead to severe consequences.

Candidate name:

Date:

Centre Assessed work

Notification of marks sheet

Subject: _____

Date: _____

Upton Hall School FCJ is committed to ensuring that whenever its staff mark candidates' work this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity. Upton Hall School FCJ is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where a number of subject teachers are involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking.

Candidates may request a review of the centre's marking before the marks are submitted to the awarding body. There must be legitimate reasons for this based on evidence regarding:

- Application of the mark scheme
- The wider teaching of the assessment content
- Concerns with the staff training and understanding of centre assessed marking
- Co-ordination and standardisation of the marking

A copy of the full policy regarding reviews of marking can be found on our website.

Please sign by your name below that you have received your mark and understand the information about internal appeals.

Appendix 4 Checklist for Subject leaders

At the start of the NEA process

- Ensure all teachers are familiar with what they can and cannot do under JCQ guidance and your specification
- Ensure all teacher have attended any relevant subject training including standardisation
- Circulate JCQ documents
- Teach the students about the guidance and what would constitute malpractice. Use the AI ppt on the JCQ guidance page
- Post copies of JCQ documents on NEA and social media on Google Classroom
- Share school guidance on AI with pupils and ask them to sign it
- Ask them to confirm their understanding of the rules

During the process

- You may give general guidance
- Records should be kept of advice and comments that go beyond the general
- Have regard to safeguarding and seek advice on choice of titles from the DSL where necessary

Handing work in

- Ensure the submission date is well publicised and known well in advance.
- Students should hand in a physical copy of their work. An emailed version is acceptable if necessary. Do not accept work on Google classroom as this is open to confusion.
- Once work is handed in for final marking, students must not have access to it
- It is malpractice for students to have the chance to improve their work once it is handed in for marking
- Students must authenticate their work after submission. Before they do so please remind them of the rules around malpractice. Once they have authenticated work, any allegations of malpractice must be referred to the exam board (rather than the school's internal procedures)

Marking coursework

- Ensure coursework is marked in accordance with exam board standards
- Ensure coursework is moderated and a record is kept of decisions made
- Moderation is planned for the February inset and it is unlikely that requests for time off timetable to mark can be accommodated.

Returning marks to pupils

- Students have a right of appeal. Ensure they know that they can query the marking and appeal if they wish
- Ensure marks are returned to pupils in good time before submission and a minimum of three weeks before the exam deadline for submission
- Ensure pupils receive marks in reasonable privacy
- Pupils should sign to say they have received marks and know they have a right of appeal
- Ensure pupils know the marks are subject to moderation

Submitting work to the exam board

- Do a final check on all paperwork to ensure it meets presentation standards relevant to the board
- Check against the entry for the exam board
- Liaise with IT in good time regarding submission
- Check if there is a conflict of interest and submit that work to the exam board as well even if not requested

Appendix 5 Student Declaration

I confirm that I have read and understood

- The school policy on malpractice
- The school guidance on AI
- JCQ advice for candidates on social media, AI, malpractice and coursework

I confirm that I understand

- My teacher can only provide general comments
- My teacher must be able to authenticate my work as my own
- Deadlines are important and can only be extended under unusual circumstances
- I must keep a record of my own research to help teachers to authenticate work as my own

I confirm that I understand I must not

- Submit work which is not my own
- Make my work available to other candidates through any medium, including social media
- Allow other candidates to have access to my own independently sourced material
- Assist other candidates to produce work
- Use books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution
- Submit work that has been word processed by a third party without acknowledgement
- Include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material
- Make use of AI in ways which are likely to constitute malpractice (see Appendix 1)

Appendix 5 Management of issues and potential risks associated with non-examination assessment

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Centre staff malpractice	Records confirm that relevant centre staff are familiar with and follow the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments and the JCQ document Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work	AMU and subject leaders
Candidate malpractice	Records confirm that candidates are informed and understand they must not: submit work which is not their own / make available their work to other candidates through any medium / allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material / assist other candidates to produce work / use books, the internet, AI or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution / submit work that has been word processed by a third party without acknowledgement / include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material.	AMU and subject leaders, subject teachers
	Task setting	
Awarding body set task: IT failure/corruption of task details where set task details accessed from the awarding body online	Awarding body key date for accessing/downloading set task noted prior to start of course IT systems checked prior to key date Alternative IT system used to gain access Awarding body contacted to request direct email of task details	IT, KSP
	Ensures that subject teachers access awarding body training information, practice materials etc.	Subject lead
	Records confirmation that subject teachers understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body's specification	
	Samples assessment criteria in the centre set task	
Centre set task: Subject teacher fails to meet the assessment criteria as	Ensures that subject teachers access awarding body training information, practice materials etc.	Subject lead

detailed in the specification	<p>Records confirmation that subject teachers understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body's specification</p> <p>Samples assessment criteria in the centre set task</p>	
Candidates do not understand the marking criteria and what they need to do to gain credit	<p>A simplified version of the awarding body's marking criteria described in the specification that is not specific to the work of an individual candidate or group of candidates is produced for candidates</p> <p>Records confirm all candidates understand the marking criteria</p> <p>Candidates confirm/record they understand the marking criteria</p>	Subject teacher
Subject teacher long term absence during the task setting stage	<p>Subject teacher long term absence during the task setting stage</p>	Subject lead
Awarding body set task not issued to candidates on time	<p>Awarding body key date for accessing set task as detailed in the specification noted prior to start of course</p> <p>Course information issued to candidates contains details when set task will be issued and needs to be completed by</p> <p>Set task accessed well in advance to allow time for planning, resourcing and teaching</p>	Subject lead
The wrong task is given to candidates	<p>Ensures course planning and information taken from the awarding body's specification confirms the correct task will be issued to candidates</p> <p>Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</p>	Subject lead
Subject teacher long term absence during the issuing of tasks stage	<p>See centre's examination contingency plan (Teaching staff extended absence)</p>	Subject lead

A candidate (or parent/carer) expresses concern about safeguarding, confidentiality or faith in undertaking a task such as a presentation that may be recorded	Ensures the candidate's presentation does not form part of the sample which will be recorded	Subject lead
	Contacts the awarding body at the earliest opportunity where unable to record the required number of candidates for the monitoring sample	PJO
Issuing of Tasks:supervision		
Planned assessments clash with other centre or candidate activities	Assessment plan identified for the start of the course Assessment dates/periods included in centre wide calendar	AMU
Rooms or facilities inadequate for candidates to take tasks under appropriate supervision	Timetabling organised to allocate appropriate rooms and IT facilities for the start of the course Staggered sessions arranged where IT facilities insufficient for number of candidates Whole cohort to undertake written task in large exam venue at the same time (exam conditions do not apply)	Amu
Insufficient supervision of candidates to enable work to be authenticated	Confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow the current JCQ document Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments and any other specific instructions detailed in the awarding body's specification in relation to the supervision of candidates Confirm subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities as detailed in the centre's non-examination assessment policy	Subject lead, AMU
A candidate is suspected of malpractice prior to submitting their work for assessment	Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (9. Malpractice) / Instructions for conducting coursework (6. Malpractice in coursework) are followed An internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed	AMU

<p>Access arrangements were not put in place for an assessment where a candidate is approved for arrangements</p>	<p>Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process (section 2), to determine the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for the candidate</p>	<p>SENCO</p>
<p>Advice and Feedback</p>		
<p>Candidate claims appropriate advice and feedback not given by subject teacher prior to starting on their work</p>	<p>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to record all information provided to candidates before work begins as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures</p> <p>Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity</p> <p>Full records kept detailing all information and advice given to candidates prior to starting on their work as appropriate to the subject and component</p> <p>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given prior to starting on their work</p>	<p>AMU</p>
<p>Candidate claims no advice and feedback given by subject teacher during the task-taking stage</p>	<p>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to record all advice and feedback provided to candidates during the task-taking stage as part of the centre's quality assurance procedure</p> <p>Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity</p> <p>Full records kept detailing all advice and feedback given to candidates during the task-taking stage as appropriate to the subject and component</p> <p>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given during the task-taking stage</p>	<p>AMU</p>
<p>A third-party claims that assistance was given to candidates by the subject teacher over and above that allowed in the regulations and specification</p>	<p>An investigation is conducted; candidates and subject teacher are interviewed and statements recorded where relevant</p> <p>Records as detailed above are provided to confirm all assistance given</p> <p>Where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body</p>	<p>AMU</p>

Candidate does not reference information from published source	Candidate is advised at a general level to reference information before work is submitted for formal assessment Candidate is again referred to the JCQ documents Information for candidates: non-examination assessments/coursework assessments Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion	Subject teacher
Candidate does not set out references as required	Candidate is advised at a general level to review and re-draft the set out of references before work is submitted for formal assessment Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments/coursework assessments Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion	Subject teacher
Candidate joins the course late after formally supervised task taking has started	A separate supervised session(s) is arranged for the candidate to catch up	Subject lead
Candidate moves to another centre during the course	Awarding body guidance is sought to determine what can be done depending on the stage at which the move takes place	HWH
An excluded pupil wants to complete his/her non-examination assessment(s)	The awarding body specification is checked to determine if the specification is available to a candidate outside mainstream education If so, arrangements for supervision, authentication and marking are made separately for the candidate	AMU
resources	Preparatory notes and the work to be assessed are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions	Subject teacher

Where memory sticks are used by candidates, these are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions

Where work is stored on the centre's network, access for candidates is restricted between formally supervised sessions

A candidate fails to acknowledge sources on work that is submitted for assessment

Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is checked to confirm all the sources used, including books, websites and audio/visual resources

Subject lead, AMU

Awarding body guidance is sought on whether the work of the candidate should be marked where candidate's detailed records acknowledges sources appropriately

Where confirmation is unavailable from candidate's records, awarding body guidance is sought and/or a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body for the candidate

Word and time limits

A candidate is penalised by the awarding body for exceeding word or time limits

Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if word or time limits are mandatory

Subject lead

Where limits are for guidance only, candidates are discouraged from exceeding them

Candidates confirm/record any information provided to them on word or time limits is known and understood

Collaboration and Group work

Candidates have worked in groups where the awarding body specification states this is not permitted

Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if group work is permitted

Teacher or SL

Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved

Authentication procedures

<p>A teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work submitted by a candidate for internal assessment</p>	<p>Records confirm subject staff have been made aware of the JCQ document Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates</p>	<p>Subject lead, AMU</p>
<p>Candidate plagiarises other material</p>	<p>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments/coursework assessments</p> <p>Candidates confirm/record that they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations for non examination assessments as outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</p> <p>The candidate's work is not accepted for assessment</p> <p>A mark of zero is recorded and submitted to the awarding body</p>	
<p>Candidate does not sign their authentication statement/declaration</p>	<p>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments/coursework assessments</p> <p>Candidates confirm/record they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations as outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments/coursework assessments</p> <p>Declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</p>	
<p>Subject teacher not available to sign authentication forms</p>	<p>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to sign authentication forms at the point of marking candidates work as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures</p>	<p>AMU</p>
<p>Presentation of work</p>		
<p>Candidate does not fully complete the awarding body's cover sheet that is attached to their worked submitted for formal assessment</p>	<p>Cover sheet is checked to ensure it is fully completed before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</p>	<p>Subject lead</p>
<p>Keeping material secure</p>		

Candidates work between formal supervised sessions is not securely stored	Records confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow current JCQ document Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments Regular monitoring/internal audit ensures subject teacher use of appropriate secure storage	Teacher/SL
Adequate secure storage not available to subject teacher	Records confirm adequate/sufficient secure storage is available to subject teacher prior to the start of the course Alternative secure storage sourced where required	Lead
Candidates work produced electronically is not securely stored	Records confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments Internal processes and regular monitoring/internal audit by IT Manager ensures access to this material is restricted; appropriate security safeguards are in place; an effective back-up strategy is employed so that an up to date archive of candidates' evidence is maintained; any sensitive digital media is encrypted (according to awarding body guidance to ensure that the method of encryption is suitable) to ensure the security of the data stored within it	Teacher/lead/ICT
Task marking – externally assessed components		
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an acceptable reason	Awarding body guidance is sought to determine if alternative assessment arrangements can be made for the candidate If not, eligibility for special consideration is explored and a request submitted to the awarding body where appropriate	AMU/Lead
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an unacceptable reason	The candidate is marked absent on the attendance register	Lead
Task marking internally assessed components		
A candidate submits little or no work	Where a candidate submits little work, the work produced is assessed against the assessment criteria and a mark allocated appropriately; where the work does not meet any of the	Teacher/lead/SEnco

	assessment criteria a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body	
	Where a candidate submits no work, the candidate is recorded as absent when marks are submitted to the awarding body	
A candidate is unable to finish their work for unforeseen reason	Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process (5), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for shortfall in work	AMU
The work of a candidate is lost or damaged	Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ documents Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (8) / Instructions for conducting coursework (16), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for lost or damaged work	AMU
Candidate malpractice is discovered	Instructions and processes in the current JCQ documents Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (9. Malpractice) / Instructions for conducting coursework (6. Malpractice in coursework) are followed Investigation and reporting procedures in the current JCQ document Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures are followed Appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are also followed	AMU
A teacher assesses the work of a candidate with whom they have a close personal relationship e.g. members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g. son/daughter)	A possible conflict of interest is declared by informing the awarding body before the published deadline for entries for each examination series Marked work of said candidate is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not	AMU/HWH
An extension to the deadline for submission of marks is required for a legitimate reason	Awarding body is contacted to determine if an extension can be granted Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process (5), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for an extension	AMU

After submission of marks, it is discovered that the wrong task was given to candidates	Awarding body is contacted for guidance Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (section 2), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for candidates	AMU
A candidate wishes to appeal/request a review of the marks awarded for their work by their teacher	Candidates are informed of the marks they have been awarded for their work prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body Records confirm candidates have been informed of their marks Candidates are informed that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process Candidates are informed of their marks to the timescale identified in the centre's internal appeals procedure and prior to the internal deadline set by the exams officer for the submission of marks Through the candidate exam handbook, candidates are made aware of the centre's internal appeals procedure and timescale for submitting an appeal/request for a review of the centre's marking prior to the submission of marks to the awarding body	Subject lead AMU
Deadline for submitting work for formal assessment not met by candidate	Records confirm deadlines given and understood by candidates at the start of the course Candidates confirm/record deadlines known and understood Depending on the circumstances, awarding body guidance sought to determine if the work can be accepted late for marking providing the awarding body's deadline for submitting marks can be met Decision made (depending on the circumstances) if the work will be accepted late for marking or a mark of zero submitted to the awarding body for the candidate	Subject lead, AMU
Deadline for submitting marks and samples of candidates work ignored by subject teacher	Internal/external deadlines are published at the start of each academic year Reminders are issued through senior leaders/subject heads as deadlines approach	AMU

Records confirm deadlines known and understood by subject teachers

Where appropriate, internal disciplinary procedures are followed

Subject teacher long term absence during the marking period

See centre's **contingency plan** (Teaching staff extended absence)

amU