

Policy Name	Non-Examination Assessment Policy
Policy Number	6
Date of Issue	September 2023
Author	A Potts
Reviewed by	RMA/JRC
Date of next review	September 2024

Non-Examination Assessment Policy

This policy is complementary to other policies relating to examinations including

- National Qualifications and External Exams
- Reviews of Marking
- Internal Appeals Policy
- Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Definition of Non-Examination Assessment (NEA)

A non-examination assessment is one that is not externally sat and taken by candidates at the same time under controlled conditions. NEA includes externally marked and/or externally set practical examinations as well as modules contributing to external assessment that taken at different times within the course, internally assessed and then externally moderated. This includes the English Language Speaking Endorsement at GCSE and the Practical Skills endorsement for A Level Sciences

Aims:

This policy aims 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

Definition

The JCQ explains that non-examination assessments measure subject-specific knowledge and skills that cannot be tested by timed written papers. There are three assessment stages; task-setting, task-taking and task-marking, and rules which apply to each stage. The rules often vary across subjects.

This policy also applies to qualifications outside JCQ jurisdiction that have a non-examination component.

Roles and responsibilities

Head of Centre

The Head of Centre is responsible for:

- Providing a signed declaration 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 NEA.
- Ensuring that the centre's non-examination assessment policy is fit for purpose
- Ensuring that non-examination assessments comply with JCQ guidance and awarding body subject-specific instructions, https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Instructions_NEA_23-24_FINAL.pdf
- Ensuring that the is signposted to all candidates prior to assessments taking place.
- Ensuring that efforts will be made for all candidates to have the opportunity to undertake GCSE English Language Spoken Language endorsement.

- Ensuring all reasonable steps are taken to ensure that all candidates at the centre have had the opportunity to undertake A Level Sciences practical activity.
- Ensuring the centre's internal appeals procedure clearly details the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against an internal assessment decision, and that details of this procedure are communicated and made widely available and accessible.
- Drawing to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers the centre's complaints procedure, for general complaints about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification.

College Executive team including Vice Principal (Examinations) Assistant Principal (13-16 curriculum), Assistant Principal (Sixth Form)

Senior leaders on the College Executive team are responsible for:

- Ensuring that non-examination assessments comply with JCQ guidance and awarding body subject-specific instructions.
- Ensuring that the centre wide calendar record assessment schedules by the start of the academic year.
- Understanding and complying with specific instructions relating to non-examination assessment for the relevant awarding body.

Internal Quality Assurer (NCFE)

The Internal Quality Assurer is responsible for:

- Ensuring learners are booked for the controlled assessment on the NCFE portal
- Ensuring that the assessor marks tasks in accordance with relevant NCFE guidelines appropriate to the task.
- Ensuring the Synoptic task has been accessed by the EO and passed on to the relevant Subject Leader, including the learner record form.
- Ensuring that students are notified of the time scales in which to complete the task.
- Ensuring appropriate procedures are in place to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by the tutors in line with the awarding body criteria
- Ensuring appropriate centre-devised relevant information is received and understood by candidates
- Where not provided by the awarding body, ensuring a centre-devised template is provided for candidates to keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc.

Subject teacher

- Ensuring [JCQ Instructions for conducting Non-Examined assessments](#), and relevant awarding body subject specific instructions are followed in relation to the conduct of non-examination assessments (including endorsements)

- Where these may also be provided by the awarding body, understanding and complying with the awarding body's specification for conducting non-examination assessments, including any subject-specific instructions, teachers' notes or additional information on the awarding body's website
- Marking internally assessed work to the criteria provided by the awarding body
- Ensuring 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

Subject Leaders

Subject leaders are responsible for:

- Ensuring subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities within the non-examination assessment process
- Ensuring [JCQ Instructions for conducting Non-Examined assessments](#), and relevant awarding body subject specific instructions are followed in relation to the conduct of non-examination assessments (including endorsements)
- Understanding and complying with specific instructions relating to non-examination assessment for the relevant awarding body (including NCFE).
- Ensuring that individual subject teachers understand their responsibilities with regard to non-examination assessment.
- Ensuring that subject teachers use the correct task for the year of submission and take care to distinguish between tasks and requirements for legacy and new specifications, where relevant
- Obtaining confidential materials/tasks set by awarding bodies in sufficient time to prepare for the assessment(s), where relevant, and ensuring that such materials are stored securely at all times.
- Where not provided by the awarding body, ensuring a centre devised template is provided for candidates to keep a detailed record of their own research, planning resources etc.
- Undertaking appropriate departmental standardisation of non-examination assessments.
- Undertaking internal quality assurance/moderation in line with specific awarding body requirements (e.g. Internal Quality Assurer for NCFE)
- Working with Internal Quality Assurer (NCFE) to ensure appropriate procedures are followed to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by learning tutors.

Examinations Officer

The Examination Officer is responsible for:

- Supporting the administration/management of non-examination assessment

- Liaising with Subject leaders to ensure that the correct entry codes are provided by the internal deadline for entries, for the qualifications, including any separate codes for NEA.
- Ensuring the College protocols on submission of materials are followed:
- 1. Exam office to communicate with subject leader to, select NEA work called by the moderator
 2. Subject leaders to package selected work called for by the Awarding Body.
 3. Exam Office and Subject Leader to check NEA selected work, ensuring a copy is kept at the centre in secure storage.
 4. Exam office to organise postage (registered post)
 5. Exam office to record information on NEA Postal Record, along with the tracking number.
 6. Main Office to check tracking and ensure the package has been delivered.
- Ensuring relevant centre staff are aware of the annually updated JCQ publication ([JCQ – Instructions for Conducting Non-Examined Assessments](#)).

SENCO

The SENCO is responsible for:

- Ensuring access arrangements for eligible candidates are applied to assessments in line with [JCQ Publication – Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments](#)

STAGES of NEA

TASK SETTING

Subject Leaders

Where the Centre is responsible for task-setting for a specific subject, in accordance with specific awarding body guidelines, Subject leaders will:

- Select from non-examination assessment tasks provided by the awarding body, or
- Design their own tasks, in conjunction with candidates where permitted, using criteria set out in the specification
- Ensure that candidates understand the assessment criteria for any given assessment task.
- Exam officer to issue set tasks from the awarding body, within the time frame set by the awarding body.
- Identify when tasks should be taken by candidates
- Access set tasks in sufficient time to allow planning, resourcing and teaching.
- Ensure all materials are stored securely at all times

TASK TAKING

Subject teachers

Where appropriate to the component being assessed, the following arrangements apply unless the awarding body's specification says otherwise.

Supervision

Subject teachers will ensure that:

- There is sufficient supervision of every candidate to enable work to be authenticated as the candidates own work
- The work that an individual candidate submits for assessment is his/her own
- That the awarding body's subject-specific requirements regarding required conditions and supervision arrangements are followed.
- Where work may be completed outside of the Centre without direct supervision, that the Centre is confident that the work produced is the candidate's own.
- Where candidates are able to work in groups, a record of each candidate's individual contribution is kept
- Candidates are aware of the current JCQ documents [Information for candidates - non-examination assessments](#), [Information for candidates - Social Media, AI- Use in Assessments – Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications](#)
- Candidates understand the need to reference work and give guidance on how to do this.
- Candidates are aware that they must not plagiarise or copy AI other material, it must be the candidates own work

Advice and feedback

Subject teachers will:

- Not provide model answers or writing frames specific to the task (such as outlines, paragraph headings or section headings).
- Review candidates' work and provide oral and written advice at a general level, unless specifically prohibited by the awarding body's specification.
- Allow candidates to revise and redraft work following advice given at a general level.
- Ensure that any assistance that goes beyond general advice will be recorded and either taken into account when marking the work, or submitted to the external examiner.
- When marking work, use annotations to explain how marks were applied in the context of the additional assistance given.
- Not provisionally assess work and then allow candidates to revise it.
- Not give explicitly prohibited assistance.

Resources

Subject teachers will:

- Be aware of the awarding body's restrictions with regard to access to resources when planning and researching their tasks.
- Ensure that, unless otherwise specified by the awarding body, in formally supervised sessions, candidates can only take in preparatory notes. They will not access the internet, nor bring in their own computers or electronic devices.
- Ensure that, appropriate arrangements will be put in place to keep the work to be assessed, and any preparatory work, secure between any formally supervised sessions, including work stored electronically.
- Ensure that conditions for any formally supervised sessions are understood and followed by candidates.
- Ensure that candidates will not introduce new resources between formally supervised sessions.
- Ensure that preparatory work and the work to be assessed will be collected and stored securely at the end of each session and will not be accessible to candidates.
- Ensure that where appropriate, to include references, candidates keep a detailed record of their research, planning, resources etc.

Word and time limits

The Subject teacher will refer to the awarding body's specification where word and time limits apply/are mandatory.

Group work

Unless the specification says otherwise, candidates are free to collaborate when carrying out research and preparatory work.

Where it is permitted, some assignments may be undertaken as part of a group.

Where an assignment requires written work to be produced, each candidate will write up his/her own account of the assignment. Individual contributions will be clearly identified so that it is possible to attribute assessable outcomes to individual candidates.

Group assessment is not permitted.

Authentication

Subject teachers will:

- Ensure that they are sufficiently familiar with the candidate's general standard to judge whether the piece of work submitted is within his/her capabilities.
- Ensure that where required by the awarding body's specifications, candidates will sign a declaration to confirm that the work they submit for final assessment is their own unaided work.

- Sign a declaration of authentication after the work has been completed confirming that: (Electronic signatures are acceptable)
 - The work is solely that of the candidate concerned
 - The work was completed under the required conditions
- Ensure that signed candidate declarations are kept on file until the deadline for requesting reviews of results has passed, or any appeal, malpractice or any other results enquiry has been completed.
- Ensure that signed candidate declarations are made available as requested by JCC Centre Inspector.
- Ensure that if there is concern that malpractice may have occurred or the work is unable to be authenticated, the procedures for authentication and malpractice in [JCC – Instructions for Conducting Non-Examined Assessments](#) are followed and the Head of Centre will be informed.
- 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 marks awarded by the centre to zero.

Use of AI in Assessments – Preventing Plagiarism

The College recognises the prevalence of AI and the opportunities for students to use AI within their NEA and the potential for Malpractice to occur.

What is AI?

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications. Misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. The College is aware that AI tools are evolving quickly but there are still limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content. However, the use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments.

What is AI misuse?

Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own.

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

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment 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.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). Instances of Malpractice by students within the College will be dealt with in accordance with the College Malpractice & Maladministration policy.

Mitigation

In order to prevent cases of student malpractice during NEA assessments, the College will ensure that students and parents are advised of appropriate and inappropriate use of AI in a qualification assessment and make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice. To further mitigate against this the College will:

- Explain the importance of students submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;
- Ensure that the vast majority of any NEA work is conducted within College where staff can more closely supervise students and access to AI tools is blocked under College ICT filtering.
- Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages;
- Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material;
- Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;
- Ensure students are given clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites) and acknowledge any use of AI;
- Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools
- Ensure that, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, AI tools have been blocked from student use.
- Ensure that each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate *JCQ Information for Candidates* (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents);
- Reinforce to students the significance of their (electronic) declaration where they confirm the work they're submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject;
- Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice
- Ensure that teachers are aware that the College policy is that they must not use AI tools to assess students work.

Acknowledging use of AI and assessing student work where AI is acknowledged

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2024.

The student must, retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used. This must be submitted with the work the student submits for assessment, so the subject teacher is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the College suspects that the student has used AI tools, the College will follow its policy on Malpractice and Maladministration.

Students will be reminded that if they use AI, they will not have independently met the marking criteria so will not receive credit for any section where they have used AI. Where students' referencing is incomplete, students will be expected to rectify this.

When marking student work in which AI use has been acknowledged, and there are no concerns of AI misuse, the subject teacher must still ensure that if the student has used AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they are not rewarded.

Depending upon the marking criteria or grade descriptors being applied, the subject teacher may need to take into account the failure to independently demonstrate their understanding of certain aspects when determining the appropriate mark/ grade to be awarded. Where such AI use has been considered, and particularly where this has had an impact upon the final marks/grades awarded by the subject teacher, the subject leader, Vice Principal and Examinations officer must be consulted and clear records should be kept – this provides feedback to the student and provides clarity in the event of an internal appeal or the work being selected for moderation/ standards verification.

Identifying misuse

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

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

Subject staff could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

Potential indicators of AI misuse

If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication that the student has misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations
- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not be appropriate to the qualification level
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected
- Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled) which might be notable for some subjects. Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
- A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- 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
- 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
- The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- 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
- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

Where unsure, subject staff may be encouraged to use automated detection services to identify where AI has been used but not acknowledged

Reporting

If inappropriate use of AI has been identified and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, your centre doesn't need to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. The College will follow procedures outlined in its Malpractice and Maladministration policy. These should include ensuring that students are aware of what malpractice is, how to avoid malpractice, how to properly reference sources and acknowledge AI tools, etc.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that students do not submit inauthentic work.

If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation. The procedure is detailed in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).

Presentation of work

Subject teachers will:

- Ensure that the correct task is issued to the students.
- Obtain informed consent at the beginning of the course from parents/carers if videos or photographs of candidates will be included as evidence of participation or contribution.
- Instruct candidates to present work as detailed in the [JCQ – Instructions for Conducting Non-Examined Assessments](#) unless the awarding body's specification gives different subject-specific instructions
- Ensure that candidates add their candidate and centre numbers and the component code of the assessment as a header/footer on each page of their work.

Keeping Materials Secure

Subject teachers 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 [JCQ – Instructions for Conducting Non-Examined Assessments](#)
- Take sensible precautions when work is taken home for marking
- Stores 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 the IT Manager to ensure the protection and back-up of candidates' work and that appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access to it between sessions.
- Understand 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 Systems Manager

The IT Systems Manager will:

- 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 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.

TASK MARKING

Externally-Assessed Work

Subject Leaders

Subject Leaders will:

- Liaise with the visiting examiner where this may be applicable to any externally assessed component.
- Liaise with the examinations officer to ensure externally-assessed components are conducted within a window of dates specified by the awarding body and where applicable according to the JCQ Publication for conducting examinations.

Subject teachers

Subject teachers will:

- Ensure the attendance register is completed, clearly indicating those candidates who are present or absent.

Examinations officer

The examinations officer will:

- Ensure that the attendance register is provided for learning tutors and is completed correctly
- Keep a copy of the attendance register until after the deadline of review of results for the exam series

Internally Assessed Work

Subject teachers

Subject teachers will:

- Ensure that they are marking work in accordance with the relevant marking criteria.
- Attend awarding body training as required to ensure familiarity with the mark scheme/marketing process.
- Ensure that they do not use AI tools to assess students 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, in line with the Internal Appeals Procedure, which could be subject to change by the awarding body moderation process.
- Inform candidates of internally-assessed marks so that candidates can request a review of the Centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body, and are aware of the timescales to submit this appeal. Further details are contained in the policy on Internal Appeals Procedure.

- Make it clear to candidate's that any internally-assessed marks are subject to change during the Awarding Bodies moderation process.
- Keep candidates work secure until after the closing date for review of results for the series or until any appeal, malpractice or any other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later.

Subject Leaders

Subject leaders will:

- Ensure accurate standardisation of the marks is completed at several stages during the period of marking.
- Ensure evidence is kept of standardisation and where marks have been altered.

Submission of Materials (Externally/Internally assessed components)

The Examinations Officer will:

- Ensure that candidate materials are sent by the date specified by the awarding body and packaged in accordance with JCQ, specific awarding body guidelines and College protocols.
- Package work as required by the awarding body and attach examiner/moderator address.
- Ensure marks are submitted online and checks made to avoid transcription errors by the deadline for the awarding body.
- Ensure requested samples of candidates' work are submitted to the moderator, by awarding body deadlines.
- Keep a record of names and candidate numbers for candidates whose work is included in the sample.
- Ensure that subject areas retain all candidates work including that returned after moderation, under secure conditions for the required retention period (using photos, audio or wider media recordings where necessary).

External/Internal Moderation feedback

Subject Leaders

Subject leaders will:

- Check final moderation marks when issued to centres following publication of results.
- Check moderation reports and ensure any necessary remedial action is undertaken before the next examination series.

Storage and Retention (Between sessions and After Marking)

Subject teachers

Subject teachers will:

- Ensure that work undertaken by candidates under formal supervision is stored securely between these sessions and that work is securely stored after completion.
- Ensure work is securely stored in line with JCQ – NEA including liaison with IT team as appropriate for secure storage of electronic work in a secure area.
- Take sensible precautions when work is taken off-site for marking.
- Store internally assessed work securely on site until the deadline for requesting reviews of results has passed or any appeal, malpractice or any other results enquiry has been completed.
- Remind candidates of the need to keep their work secure at all times and not share completed or partially completed work on-line, through social media or through any other means (bringing to the attention of candidates the JCQ document: Information for candidates – social media).
- If requested, return any internally assessed work to candidates once review of results and any subsequent appeal have been completed.

IT Manager

The IT Manager will:

- Ensure arrangements are made to restrict access between sessions to candidate's work stored electronically.
- Utilise appropriate safeguards such as firewall protection and virus scanning software.
- Employ an effective back-up strategy so that an up to date archive of candidate's work is maintained.
- Ensure work stored electronically is protected from corruption and there is a back-up procedure in place.

Conflicts of interest

The Head of Centre will ensure every effort is made to avoid situations where a conflict of interest can occur (e.g. where a tutor teaches his/her own child). Where a conflict of interest is unavoidable, the Head of Centre will ensure that this is declared to the awarding body and the marked work of the child submitted for moderation, whether it is part of the moderation sample or not.

Malpractice

Head of Centre

The Head of Centre will:

- Ensure that they are familiar with the **Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications, Plagiarism in Assessments**
- Ensure any irregularity identified by the centre before the candidate has signed the authentication statement (where required) is 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 material has been breached, the breach must be report to the awarding body)
- Ensure that they understand the responsibility to immediately report to the relevant awarding body any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates, tutors, invigilators or other administrative staff.
- Along with the Executive team, make sure teaching staff involved in supervising candidates are aware of the potential for malpractice and understands the need to escalate and report any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates to the Head of Centre.
- Along with the Executive team, ensure that all College staff understand that failure to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself. Malpractice will be reported to senior leaders or directly to the awarding body.

Subject teachers

Subject teachers will:

- Be vigilant in relation to candidate malpractice.
- Ensure that candidates know what constitutes malpractice, candidates must not:
 - Submit work which is not their own.
 - Make their work available to other candidates through any medium, including social media.
 - Allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material.
 - Assist other candidates to produce work.
 - Use books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution including AI.

- Submit work that has been word processed by a third party without acknowledgement.
- Include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material.

Examinations officer

The Examinations Officer will:

- Ensure that the [JCQ Notices to Centres – Sharing NEA material and candidates work](#) is signposted to subject leaders and that the relevant [JCQ Information for Candidates - NEA](#) documents are signposted to candidates.
- Where necessary, assist the Head of Centre/Executive team in investigating and reporting incidents of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice.

Enquiries about results

Candidates will be made aware of the arrangements for Enquiries about Results before they take any assessments in line with the [JCQ Publication – Post Results Services](#). Further details are contained in the College policy on Procedures for Enquiries about Results.

Management of issues and potential risks with non-examination assessments.

The following pages summarise the risks and measures taken to ensure that risks are minimised along with the procedures for remedial action.

The final column identifies staff using a RACI structure.

R responsible for the risk/issue;

A accountable for the risk/issue;

C who should be **consulted** about this risk/issue;

I who should be **informed** if the risk/issue arises;

Codes:

ST	Subject teacher
SL	Subject Leader
EO	Exam Officer
EM	Exams Manager, Director of Timetabling
P	Principal
VP	Vice Principal
Sys	ICT Systems Manager
AB	Awarding Body
AP	Assistant Principal

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Timetabling			
NEA schedule clashes with other activities	Plan/establish priorities well ahead, enter on assessment schedule	Plan dates in consultation with College calendar – negotiate with other parties	R – SL KS4/5 A – VP C – SL, EO I - Students
Too many NEAs close together across GCSE subjects	Plan NEAs so they are spaced over the duration of the course	Space NEAs to allow candidates some time between them	R – AP KS4/5 A – VP C – SL, EO I - Students
Accommodation			
Insufficient space in classrooms for candidates	Once the size of the cohort is known at the start of the year, flag instances where regular classroom space may not be suitable to conduct NEAs	Use more than one classroom or multiple sittings where necessary	R – SL A – AP KS4/5 C – EM, EO I - Students
Insufficient facilities for all candidates	Careful planning ahead and booking of rooms / centre facilities		R – SL, EM A – AP KS4/5 C –EO I - Students

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Downloading awarding body set tasks			
IT system unavailable on day of assessment	Download tasks well ahead of scheduled assessment date in all cases	Book IT equipment well ahead and download tasks before scheduled date of assessment	R – ST, Sys A – SL C – AP KS4/5 I – EM
Teaching staff unable to access task details	Test secure access rights ahead of NEA schedule every year and every session	Ensure teaching staff have access rights for the correct area of awarding body secure extranet sites well ahead of the NEA schedule	R – ST A – SL C – EO I – AP KS4/5
Loss of task details in transmission	Download tasks well ahead of scheduled assessment date	Contact awarding body and ask for replacement task; download again	R – LT A – CL/SL Subject C – EO I - SL KS4/5, AB
Absent candidates			
Candidates absent for all or part of assessment (various reasons)	Plan alternative session(s) for candidates		R – SL A – AP KS4 C – EO I – Student

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Control levels for task taking			
The assessment is undertaken under incorrect level of control (time, resources, supervision and collaboration)	Ensure teaching staff know what level is applicable and understand what is involved. Provide training if required	Seek guidance from the awarding body	R – ST A – SL C – EO, AB I - AP KS4/5,VP, P
Supervision			
Student study diary/plan not provided or completed (where appropriate)	Ensure teaching staff are aware of the need for study diary/plans to be completed early in course	Ensure candidates start, continue and complete study diary/plans that are signed after every session	R – ST A – SL C – AP KS4/5 I – EO, VP
Teaching staff do not understand that the supervision of NEAs is their responsibility	Ensure teaching staff fully understand the nature of NEAs and their role in supervising assessments		R – ST A – AP/SL, EO C – AP KS4/5 I – VP
A suitable supervisor has not been arranged for an assessment where teaching staff are not supervising	A suitable supervisor must be arranged for any NEA session where a teacher is not supervising, in line with the awarding body's specification		R – EM A – EO C – AP KS4/5 I – VP

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Advice and Feedback			
Candidate claims appropriate advice and feedback not given by subject teacher prior to starting their work	Ensure consistent processes to record all information provided to candidates before work begins. Regular monitoring.	Seek guidance from the awarding body	R – ST A – SL C – EO, AB I – AP KS4/5, VP, P
Malpractice			
A candidate is suspected of malpractice prior to submitting their work for assessment	Ensure that candidates are aware of their responsibilities to ensure that the work is their own and not plagiarised	Follow instructions in JCQ guidelines (section 9 Malpractice). Conduct internal investigation and apply appropriate sanctions in line with College behavior policy	R – SL, ST A – VP C – Students I – P, AB
Learning tutor is suspected of malpractice such as giving advice over and above the regulations	Ensure teaching staff fully understand the nature of NEAs and how much advice or guidance they are allowed to give.	Conduct internal investigation and apply appropriate sanctions in line with College Grievance and Disciplinary policy. Inform awarding body as appropriate	R – SL A – VP C – ST I – P, AB

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Task setting			
Teaching staff fail to correctly set tasks	Ensure teaching staff fully understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body's specification**	Seek guidance from the awarding body	R – ST A –SL C – EO, AB I - AP KS4/5,VP, P
Assessments have not been moderated in line with the awarding body's specification	Check specification and plan required moderation appropriately	Seek guidance from the awarding body	R – ST A – SL C – EO, AB I - AP KS4/5,VP, P
Security of materials			
Assessment tasks not kept secure before assessment	Ensure teaching staff fully understand the importance of task security	Contact the awarding body to request/obtain different assessment tasks	R – ST, EO A –SL C –AB I - AP KS4/5,VP, P
Candidates' work not kept secure during or after assessment	Define the appropriate level of security, in line with the awarding body's requirements, for each department as necessary	Seek guidance from the awarding body	R – ST, EO A –SL C –AB I - AP KS4/5,VP, P
Insufficient or insecure storage space	Look at provision for suitable storage at the start of the GCSE course	Find alternative storage within the centre	R –SL, EO A – AP KS4/5 C –VP

			I - P
Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Deadlines			
Deadlines not met by candidates (e.g. BTEC)	Ensure all candidates are briefed on deadlines and the penalties for not meeting them	Mark what candidates have produced by the deadline Seek guidance from awarding body on further action	R – ST A – SL C –AB I - AP KS4/5,VP
Deadlines for marking and/or paperwork not met by teaching staff	Ensure teaching staff are given clear deadlines (prior to the awarding body deadline) to complete marking/paperwork (Marks can then be processed and submitted ahead of awarding body deadlines)	Seek guidance from awarding body	R – ST A – SL C –AB, EO I - AP KS4/5,VP,P
Authentication			
Candidate fails to sign authentication form	Ensure all candidates have authentication forms to sign Ensure that the authentication form is securely attached to their work when it is completed and handed in for marking	Find candidate and ensure authentication form is signed	R – ST A – SL C –EO, AP KS4/5 I - AB
Teaching staff fail to complete authentication forms or leave before completing the authentication process	Ensure teaching staff fully understand the importance of authentication forms and the requirement of a signature	Return the authentication form to the teacher for signature Ensure authentication forms are signed as work is marked	R – ST A – SL C –AP KS4/5 I - EO

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Marking			
Teaching staff interpret marking descriptions incorrectly	<p>Ensure appropriate training and practicing of marking</p> <p>Plan for sampling of marking during the practice phase</p>	<p>Arrange for re-marking</p> <p>Consult the awarding body's specification for appropriate procedures</p>	<p>R – ST</p> <p>A – SL</p> <p>C –AB, EO</p> <p>I - AP KS4/5,VP,P</p>
Centre does not run the standardisation activity as required by the awarding body	<p>Plan against the awarding body's requirements for standardisation, i.e. when and how this activity must be conducted</p>	<p>Check with the awarding body whether a later standardisation event can be arranged</p>	<p>R – SL</p> <p>A – AP KS4/5</p> <p>C –AB, EO</p> <p>I - VP,P</p>



LANDAU
FORTE
CHARITABLE
TRUST

Date	September 2023
Change Made	October 2024
Made By	JRC