

Non-Examination Assessment Policy 2023-24

For the attention of: All Staff
Produced by: Group Exams Manager
Approved by: SLT
Date of publication: November 2023
Date of review: August 2024





Vision, Purpose & Values

Our Vision

Our students will be recognised locally & nationally for their positive impact on the communities and industries in which they choose to work.

Our Purpose

To inspire our students to gain the skills, knowledge and behaviours they need to be resilient and thrive in an ever-changing world.

Our Values

Excellence: A culture of creativity, high expectations, ambition and aspiration

Respect: Showing fairness, courtesy and mutual respect to each other and our environment

Integrity: Honesty, openness and trust at the heart of College life

Diversity: Celebrating diversity and inclusivity as a key to our success

Non-Examination Assessment Policy 2023/24

Contents

Non-Examination Assessment Policy	1
2023-24	1
Key Staff Involved in the Conduct of Non-examination Assessments	5
1. What Does This Policy Affect?	5
2. Purpose of the Policy	5
3. What are Non-Examination Assessments?.....	6
4. Procedures for Planning and Managing Non-examination Assessments Identifying Staff Roles and Responsibilities	6
5. Task Setting	7
6. Issuing of Tasks.....	7
7. Task Taking.....	8
8. Advice and Feedback.....	8
9. Resources	9
10. Word and Time Limits	9
11. Collaboration and Group Work	9
12. Authentication Procedures	9
13. Presentation of Work.....	10
14. Keeping Materials Secure	10
15. Task Marking – Externally Assessed Components.....	10
16. Internal Standardisation	12
17. Consortium Arrangements	12
18. Submission of Marks and Work for Moderation	13
19. Storage and Retention of Work After Submission of Marks.....	14

20.	External Moderation Process	14
21.	External Moderation Feedback.....	14
22.	Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments.....	14
23.	Special Consideration and Loss of Work	15
24.	Malpractice.....	15
25.	Post-Results Services	16
26.	Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences Designed for use in England.....	17
27.	Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language Specifications Designed for use in England	18
28.	External Candidates.....	19
29.	Management of Issues and Potential Risks Associated with Non-examination Assessments	19

Key Staff Involved in the Conduct of Non-examination Assessments

Role
Head of Centre
Principals
Vice Principals
Exams Manager
Assistant Principals, Curriculum Directors and HoDs
Head of MIS and Exams
Group Director Digital Marketing & Admissions
ALS Managers (SEnCo Equivalent)

1. What Does This Policy Affect?

- 1.1. This policy affects the delivery of qualifications which contain a component(s) of non-examination assessment.
- 1.2. The regulator's definition of an examination is very narrow and in effect any type of assessment that is:
 - set by an awarding body
 - designed to be taken simultaneously by all relevant candidates at a time determined by the awarding body, and
 - taken under conditions specified by the awarding body (including conditions relating to the supervision of candidates during the assessment and the duration of the assessment).
 - 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'.
- 1.3. [Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments](#). This publication is further referred to in this policy as [NEA](#)

2. Purpose of the Policy

- 2.1. The purpose of this policy, as defined by JCQ, is to:

- *cover procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments*
- *define staff roles and responsibilities for non-examination assessments*
- *manage risks associated with non-examination assessments*

2.2. The policy will need to cover all types of non-examination assessment. ([NEA](#), section 1)

3. What are Non-Examination Assessments?

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

3.2. 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.

[\[NEA 1\]](#)

4. Procedures for Planning and Managing Non-examination Assessments Identifying Staff Roles and Responsibilities

4.1. The Basic Principles

4.1.1. Head of Centre

- Provides 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](#)
- Ensures the centre's *non-examination assessment policy* is fit for purpose and covers all types of non-examination assessment
- Ensures the centre's *internal appeals procedures* clearly detail the procedure 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

4.1.2. Curriculum Leadership Teams

- Ensure the correct conduct of non-examination assessments (including endorsements) which comply with [NEA](#) and awarding body subject-specific instructions
- Ensure the centre-wide calendar records assessment schedules by the start of the academic year

4.1.3. Lead Internal Verifiers

- Confirms with subject heads that appropriate awarding body forms and templates for non-examination assessments (including endorsements) are used by teachers and candidates
- Ensures appropriate procedures are in place to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject lecturers in line with awarding body criteria

- Ensures appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture/record relevant information given to candidates by subject lecturers
- Ensures appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture/record relevant information is received and understood by candidates
- Where not provided by the awarding body, ensures a centre-devised template is provided for candidates to keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc.

4.1.4. Curriculum Leadership Teams

- Ensures subject lecturers understand their role and responsibilities within the non-examination assessment process
- Ensures [NEA](#) and relevant awarding body subject specific instructions are followed in relation to the conduct of non-examination assessments (including endorsements)
- Works with the QA lead/Lead internal verifier to ensure appropriate procedures are followed to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject lecturers
- Understands the arrangements that the centre needs to put in place where the centre might accept private candidates (including distance learners and home educated students) for components of non-examination assessment

4.1.5. Subject Lecturer

- Understands and complies with the general instructions as detailed in [NEA](#)
- Where these may also be provided by the awarding body, understands and complies 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
- Ensures students have access to the [NEA](#) policy
- Marks internally assessed work to the criteria provided by the awarding body
- Ensures the Exams manager 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

4.1.6. Exams Manager

- Signposts the annually updated JCQ publication [NEA](#) to relevant centre staff
- Carries out tasks where these may be applicable to the role in supporting the administration/management of non-examination assessment

5. Task Setting

5.1. Subject Lecturer

- Selects 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
- Makes candidates aware of the criteria used to assess their work

6. Issuing of Tasks

6.1. Subject Lecturer

- Determines when set tasks are issued by the awarding body
- Identifies date(s) when tasks should be taken by candidates
- Accesses set tasks in sufficient time to allow planning, resourcing and teaching and ensures that materials are stored securely at all times
- Ensures requirements for legacy specification tasks and new specification tasks are distinguished between

7. Task Taking

7.1. Supervision

7.1.1. Subject Lecturer

- understand that information from all sources must be referenced
- receive guidance on setting out references
- Refers 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 (To) Refers to the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation to determine if candidates have restricted/unrestricted access to resources including the internet and AI when planning and researching their tasks
- Refers to the JCQ document **AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications (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
- Ensures there is sufficient supervision to enable the work of a candidate to be authenticated
- Ensures there is sufficient supervision to ensure the work a candidate submits is their own
- Is confident 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, keeps a record of each candidate's contribution
- Ensures candidates are aware of the current JCQ documents [Information for candidates - non-examination assessments](#) and [Information for candidates - Social Media](#)
- Ensures candidates understand and comply with the regulations in relevant JCQ documents Information for candidates

8. Advice and Feedback

8.1. Subject Lecturer

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

- Records any assistance given beyond general advice and takes it into account in the marking or submits it to the external examiner
- Ensures when work has been assessed, candidates are not allowed to revise it
- Ensures that candidates are aware of the internal appeals procedure

9. Resources

9.1. Subject Lecturer

- Refers 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
- Ensures conditions for any formally supervised sessions are known and put in place
- Ensures 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
- Ensures conditions for any formally supervised sessions are understood and followed by candidates
- Ensures candidates understand that they are not allowed to introduce improved notes or new resources between formally supervised sessions
- Ensures that where appropriate to include references, candidates keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc.

10. Word and Time Limits

10.1. Subject Lecturer

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

11. Collaboration and Group Work

11.1. Subject Lecturer

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

12. Authentication Procedures

12.1. Subject Lecturer

- Ensures candidates are aware of plagiarism and referencing rules
- Where required by the awarding body's specification:
 - ensures candidates sign a declaration confirming the work their submit for final assessment is their own unaided work
 - signs the teacher declaration of authentication confirming the requirements have been met

- Keeps 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
- Provides signed candidate declarations where these may be requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector
- Where there may be doubt about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or if malpractice is suspected, follows the authentication procedures and malpractice information in [NEA](#) and informs a member of the senior leadership team

13. Presentation of Work

13.1. Subject Lecturer

- Obtains 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
- Instructs candidates to present work as detailed in [NEA](#) unless the awarding body's specification gives different subject-specific instructions
- Instructs 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

14. Keeping Materials Secure

14.1. Subject Lecturer

- When work is being undertaken by candidates under formal supervision, ensures work is securely stored between sessions (if more than one session)
- When work is submitted by candidates for final assessment, ensures work is securely stored
- Follows secure storage instructions as defined in [NEA 4.8](#)
- Takes sensible precautions when work is taken home for marking
- Stores internally assessed work, including the sample returned after awarding body moderation, securely until the closing date for reviews of results or until the outcome of a review or any subsequent appeal has been completed
- Reminds 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 (the JCQ document Information for candidates – social media should be brought to the attention of candidates)
- Liaises with the IT Manager to ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access between sessions to candidates' work where work is stored electronically

14.2. Head of IT

- Ensures appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access between sessions to candidates' work where work is stored electronically

15. Task Marking – Externally Assessed Components

15.1. Conduct of Externally Assessed Work

15.1.1. Subject Lecturer

- Liaises with the Exams Manager 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 according to JCQ Instructions for conducting examinations
- Liaises with the Visiting Examiner where this may be applicable to any externally assessed component

15.1.2. Exams Manager

- Arranges timetabling, rooming and invigilation where and if this is applicable to any externally assessed non-examination component of a specification
- Conducts the externally assessed component within the window specified by the awarding body and according to JCQ Instructions for conducting examinations

15.2. Submission Of Work

15.2.1. Subject Lecturer

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

15.2.2. Exams Manager

- Provides the attendance register to the Subject lecturer where the component may be assessed by a Visiting Examiner
- Ensures the awarding body's attendance register for any externally assessed component is completed correctly to show candidates who are present and any who may be absent
- Where candidates' work must be dispatched to an awarding body's examiner, ensures the completed attendance register accompanies the work
- Keeps a copy of the attendance register until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series
- Packages the work as required by the awarding body and attaches the examiner address label
- Dispatches the work to the awarding body's instructions by the required deadline

15.3. Marking and Annotation

15.3.1. 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

15.3.2. Heads of Department

- Sets 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

15.3.3. Subject Lecturer

- Attends awarding body training as required to ensure familiarity with the mark scheme/marking process
- Marks candidates' work in accordance with the marking criteria provided by the awarding body
- Annotates 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
- Informs candidates of their marks which could be subject to change by the awarding body moderation process
- Ensures candidates are informed to 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

16. Internal Standardisation

16.1. Lead Internal Verifier

- Ensures that internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place as required and to sequence
- Supports staff not familiar with the mark scheme (e.g. ECTs, supply staff etc.)
- Ensures accurate internal standardisation - for example by
 1. obtaining reference materials at an early stage in the course
 2. holding a preliminary trial marking session prior to marking
 3. carrying out further trial marking at appropriate points during the marking period
 4. after most marking has been completed, holds a further meeting to make final adjustments
 5. making final adjustments to marks prior to submission
 6. retaining work and evidence of standardisation
- Retains evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out

16.2. Subject Lecturer

- Indicates on work (or cover sheet) the date of marking
- Marks to common standards
- Keeps 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

17. Consortium Arrangements

17.1. Heads of Department

- Ensures a consortium coordinator is nominated (where this may be required as the consortium lead)
- If the consortium lead, liaises with the Exams manager to ensure the awarding body is notified by submission of the Centre consortium arrangements for centre-

assessed work (including Spoken Language Endorsements, GCSE English Language) for each exam series affected

- Ensures procedures for internal standardisation as a consortium are followed

17.2. Subject Lecturer

- Provides marks to the Exams manager to the internal deadline
- Provides the moderation sample to the Exams manager to the internal deadline
- Retains all candidates' work in the consortium until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later

17.3. Exams Manager

- Where the centre is the consortium lead:
 - submits the notification of Centre consortium arrangements for centre-assessed work via the awarding body's Centre Admin Portal (CAP) to the deadline for each exam series affected
 - submits marks to the awarding body deadline
 - liaises with other consortium Exams managers to arrange dispatch of a single moderation sample to the awarding body deadline

18. Submission of Marks and Work for Moderation

18.1. Heads of Departments

18.1.1. This may be delegated to a designated nominee by the Head of Department.

18.1.2. Inputs and submits 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 Manager to the internal deadline:

- Where responsible for marks input, ensures checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensures mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors
- Submits 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 manager to the internal deadline
- Ensures 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
- 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

18.2. Exams Manager

- Ensures 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 head of department, 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

19. Storage and Retention of Work After Submission of Marks

19.1. Head of Department

- Keeps a record of names and candidate numbers for candidates whose work was included in the moderation sample
- Retains all marked candidates' work (including any sample returned after moderation) under secure conditions for the required retention period
- Takes steps to protect any work stored electronically from corruption and has a back-up procedure in place
- Retains evidence of work where retention may be a problem (for example, photos of artefacts etc.)

19.2. Exams Manager

- Ensures any sample returned after moderation is logged and returned to the Subject lecturer for secure storage and required retention

20. External Moderation Process

20.1. Head of Department

- Ensures that awarding body or its moderator receive the correct samples of candidates' work
- Where relevant, liaises with the awarding body/moderator where the moderator visits the centre to mark the sample of work
- Complies with any request from the moderator for remaining work or further evidence of the centre's marking

21. External Moderation Feedback

21.1. Heads of Department

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

21.2. Exams Manager

- Accesses or signposts moderator reports to relevant staff
- Takes remedial action, if necessary, where feedback may relate to centre administration

22. Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments

22.1. Subject Lecturer

- Works with the SENCo to ensure any access arrangements for eligible candidates are applied to assessments

22.2. ALS Managers

- Follows the regulations and guidance in the JCQ publication [Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments](#) in relation to non-examination assessments including [Reasonable Adjustments for GCE A-level sciences – Endorsement of practical skills](#)
- Where arrangements do not undermine the integrity of the qualification and is the candidate's normal way of working, will ensure access arrangements are in place and awarding body approval, where required, has been obtained prior to assessments taking place
- Makes subject lecturers aware of any access arrangements for eligible candidates which need to be applied to assessments
- Works with subject lecturers to ensure requirements for access arrangement candidates requiring the support of a facilitator in assessments are met
- Ensures that staff acting as an access arrangement facilitator are fully trained in their role

23. Special Consideration and Loss of Work

23.1. Subject Lecturer

- Understands 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
- Liaises with the Exams manager when special consideration may need to be applied for a candidate taking assessments
- Liaises with the Exams manager to report loss of work to the awarding body

23.2. Exams Manager

- Refers to/directs relevant staff to the JCQ publication [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
- Refers to/directs relevant staff to [Form 15 – JCQ/LCW](#) and where applicable submits to the relevant awarding body

24. Malpractice

24.1. Head of Centre

- Understands the responsibility to immediately report to the relevant awarding body any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates, teachers, invigilators or other administrative staff
- Is familiar with the JCQ publication [Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures](#)
- Ensures that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing non-examination assessment are aware of the potential for

malpractice and ensures that teaching staff are reminded that failure to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself

24.2. Subject Lecturer

- Is aware of the JCQ [Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work to mitigate against candidate and centre malpractice](#)
- Ensures candidates understand the JCQ document [Information for candidates - non- examination assessments](#)
- Ensures candidates understand the JCQ document [Information for candidates - Social Media](#)
- Escalates and reports any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates to the head of centre

24.3. Exams Manager

- Signposts the JCQ publication [Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures](#) to the head of centre
- Signposts the JCQ [Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work](#) to subject heads
- Signposts candidates to the relevant JCQ information for candidates documents
- Where required, supports the head of centre in investigating and reporting incidents of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice

25. Post-Results Services

25.1. Head of Centre

- Is familiar with the JCQ publication [Post-Results Services](#)
- Ensures the centre's *internal appeals procedures* clearly detail the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against a centre decision not to support a review of results or an appeal

25.2. Heads of Department

- Provides relevant support to Subject lecturers making decisions about reviews of results

25.3. Subject Lecturer

- Provides advice and guidance to candidates on their results and the post-results services available
- Provides the Exams manager with the original sample or relevant sample of candidates' work that may be required for a review of moderation to the internal deadline
- Supports the Exams manager in collecting candidate consent where required

25.4. Exams Manager

- Is aware of the individual post-results services available for externally assessed and internally assessed components of non-examination assessments as detailed in the JCQ publication [Post-Results Services \(Information and guidance to centres...\)](#)
- Provides/signposts relevant centre staff and candidates to post-results services information

- Ensures any requests for post-results services that are available to non-examination assessments are submitted online via the awarding body secure extranet site to deadline
- Collects candidate consent where required

26. Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences Designed for use in England

26.1. Head of Centre

- Provides a signed declaration as part of the National Centre Number Register Annual Update, that 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 prescribed practical activities
- Ensures new lead teachers undertake the required training provided by the awarding body on the implementation of the practical endorsement
- Ensures relevant centre staff liaise with all relevant parties in relation to arrangements for and conduct of the monitoring visit

26.2. Lead Internal Verifier

- Ensures the appropriate arrangements are in place for implementing the requirements of the practical endorsement appropriately and applying the assessment criteria correctly

26.3. Heads of Department

- Confirms understanding of the *Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences designed for use in England* and ensures any relevant JCQ/awarding body instructions are followed
- Ensures 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
- Undertakes any training provided by the awarding body on the implementation of the practical endorsement
- Disseminates information to Subject lecturers ensuring the standards can be applied appropriately
- Liaises with all relevant parties in relation to arrangements for and conduct of a monitoring visit

26.4. Subject Lecturer

- Ensures all the JCQ/awarding body requirements/instructions in relation to the endorsement are known, understood and followed
- Ensures the required arrangements for practical activities are in place
- Provides all the required centre records
- Ensures candidates provide the required records
- Provides any required information to the subject lead regarding the monitoring visit
- Assesses candidates using Common Practical Assessment Criteria (CPAC)
- Applies for an exemption where a candidate cannot access the practical endorsement due to a substantial impairment

- Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of candidates *Pass* or *Not Classified* assessment outcome/provides assessment outcomes to the Exams manager to the internal deadline

26.5. Exams Manager

- Accepts contact with the monitor and pass information to the subject lead for a visit to be arranged with at least two weeks' notice
- Confirms with the Subject lecturer that assessment outcomes have been submitted to the awarding body to the external deadline/Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of candidates *Pass* or *Not Classified* assessment outcome

27. Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language Specifications Designed for use in England

27.1. Head of Centre

- Provides a signed declaration as part of the National Centre Number Register Annual Update, that 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 Spoken Language endorsement

27.2. Lead Internal Verifier

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

27.3. Heads of Department

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

27.4. Subject Lecturer

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

27.5. Exams Manager

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

28. External Candidates

28.1. Heads of Department

- According to centre policy, confirms if private candidates (including distance learners and home educated candidates) are accepted by the centre for entry for subjects containing components of non-examination assessment (where the specification may be made available to private candidates by the awarding body)
- Ensures relevant staff in the centre administer all aspects of the non-examination assessment process for a private candidate, according to the awarding body's specification

29. Management of Issues and Potential Risks Associated with Non-examination Assessments

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Task setting		
Awarding body set task: IT failure/corruption of task details where set task details accessed from the awarding body online	<i>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</i>	Head of IT and Exams Manager
Centre set task: Subject lecturer fails to meet the assessment criteria as detailed in the specification	<i>Ensures that subject lecturers access awarding body training information, practice materials etc. Records confirmation that Subject lecturers understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body's specification Samples assessment criteria in the centre set task</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager
Candidates do not understand the marking criteria and what their need to do to gain credit	<i>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 Records confirm all candidates understand the marking criteria Candidates confirm/record their understand the marking criteria</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Subject Lecturers
Subject lecturer long term absence during the task setting stage	<i>See Centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams
Issuing of tasks		

Task for legacy specification given to candidates undertaking new specification	<i>Ensures Subject lecturers take care to distinguish between requirements/tasks for legacy specifications and requirements/tasks for new specifications Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Subject Lecturers
Awarding body set task not issued to candidates on time	<i>Awarding body key date for accessing set task as detailed in the specification noted prior to start of course Course information issued to candidates contains details when set task will be issued and needs to be completed by Set task accessed well in advance to allow time for planning, resourcing and teaching</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Subject Lecturers
The wrong task is given to candidates	<i>Ensures course planning and information taken from the awarding body's specification confirms the correct task will be issued to candidates Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager
Subject lecturer long term absence during the issuing of tasks stage	<i>See Centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams
A candidate (or parent/carer) expresses concern about safeguarding, confidentiality or faith in undertaking a task such as a presentation that may be recorded	<i>Ensures the candidate's presentation does not form part of the sample which will be recorded Contacts the awarding body at the earliest opportunity where unable to record the required number of candidates for the monitoring sample</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams, Exams' Manager and Safeguarding and Welfare Teams
Task taking		
Supervision		
Planned assessments clash with other centre or candidate activities	<i>Assessment plan identified for the start of the course Assessment dates/periods included in centre wide calendar</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Subject Lecturers
Rooms or facilities inadequate for candidates to take tasks under appropriate supervision	<i>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)</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Subject Lecturers

Insufficient supervision of candidates to enable work to be authenticated	<i>Confirm Subject lecturers are aware of and follow the current JCQ publication 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</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams
	<i>Confirm Subject lecturers understand their role and responsibilities as detailed in the Centre's non-examination assessment policy</i>	
A candidate is suspected of malpractice prior to submitting their work for assessment	<i>Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (section 9 Malpractice) are followed</i> <i>An internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed</i>	Head of Centre, Principals, Vice Principals and Exams' Manager
Access arrangements were not put in place for an assessment where a candidate is approved for arrangements	<i>Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (section 2), to determine the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for the candidate</i>	ALS Managers & Exams' Manager
Advice and feedback		
Candidate claims appropriate advice and feedback not given by subject lecturer prior to starting on their work	<i>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject lecturers to record all information provided to candidates before work begins as part of the Centre's quality assurance procedures</i> <i>Regular monitoring of subject lecturer completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity. Full records kept detailing all information and advice given to candidates prior to starting on their work as appropriate to the subject and component</i> <i>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given prior to starting on their work</i>	Head of Centre, Principals, Vice Principals and Exams' Manager

<p>Candidate claims no advice and feedback given by subject lecturer during the task-taking stage</p>	<p><i>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject lecturers to record all advice and feedback provided to candidates during the task-taking stage as part of the Centre's quality assurance procedures</i></p> <p><i>Regular monitoring of subject lecturer completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity</i></p> <p><i>Full records kept detailing all advice and feedback given to candidates during the task-taking stage as appropriate to the subject and component</i></p> <p><i>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given during the task-taking stage</i></p>	<p>Head of Centre, Principalship and Exams' Manager</p>
<p>A third-party claims that assistance was given to candidates by the subject lecturer over and above that allowed in the regulations and specification</p>	<p><i>An investigation is conducted; candidates and Subject lecturer are interviewed and statements recorded where relevant</i></p> <p><i>Records as detailed above are provided to confirm all assistance given</i></p> <p><i>Where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body</i></p>	<p>Head of Centre, Principals, Vice Principals and Exams' Manager</p>
<p>Candidate does not reference information from published source</p>	<p><i>Candidate is advised at a general level to reference information before work is submitted for formal assessment</i></p> <p><i>Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document</i></p> <p><i>Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i></p> <p><i>Candidate's detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion</i></p>	<p>Head of Centre, Principals, Vice Principals and Exams' Manager</p>
<p>Candidate does not set out references as required</p>	<p><i>Candidate is advised at a general level to review and re-draft the set out of references before work is submitted for formal assessment</i></p> <p><i>Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document</i></p> <p><i>Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i></p> <p><i>Candidate's detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion</i></p>	<p>Directors, Heads of Departments and Exams Manager</p>

Candidate joins the course late after formally supervised task taking has started	<i>A separate supervised session(s) is arranged for the candidate to catch up</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams
Candidate moves to another centre during the course	<i>Awarding body guidance is sought to determine what can be done depending on the stage at which the move takes place</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager
An excluded student wants to complete their non- examination assessment(s)	<i>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</i>	Head of Centre, Principals, Vice Principals and Exams' Manager
Resources		
A candidate augments notes and resources between formally supervised sessions	<i>Preparatory notes and the work to be assessed are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions 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</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams, subject lecturers and Exams' Manager
A candidate fails to acknowledge sources on work that is submitted for assessment	<i>Candidate's detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc. is checked to confirm all the sources used, including books, websites and audio/visual resources 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</i>	Directors, Heads of Departments and Exams Manager
Word and time limits		

<p>A candidate is penalised by the awarding body for exceeding word or time limits</p>	<p><i>Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if word or time limits are mandatory</i></p> <p><i>Where limits are for guidance only, candidates are discouraged from exceeding them</i></p> <p><i>Candidates confirm/record any information provided to them on word or time limits is known and understood</i></p>	<p>Directors, Heads of Departments and Subject Lecturers</p>
Collaboration and group work		
<p>Candidates have worked in groups where the awarding body specification states this is not permitted</p>	<p><i>Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if group work is permitted</i></p> <p><i>Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</i></p>	<p>Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager</p>
Authentication procedures		
<p>A teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work submitted by a candidate for internal assessment</p> <p>Candidate plagiarises other material</p>	<p><i>Records confirm subject staff have been made aware of the JCQ document Teachers sharing assessment material and candidates' work</i></p> <p><i>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i></p> <p><i>Candidates confirm/record that their understand what their need to do to comply with the regulations for non-examination assessments as outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i></p> <p><i>The candidate's work is not accepted for assessment A mark of zero is recorded and submitted to the awarding body</i></p>	<p>Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager</p>
<p>Candidate does not sign their authentication statement/declaration</p>	<p><i>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i></p> <p><i>Candidates confirm/record their understand what their need to do to comply with the regulations as outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i></p> <p><i>Declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</i></p>	<p>Curriculum Leadership Teams and Subject Lecturers</p>

Subject lecturer not available to sign authentication forms	<i>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for Subject lecturers to sign authentication forms at the point of marking candidates work as part of the Centre's quality assurance procedures</i>	Head of Centre, Principals and Vice Principals
Presentation of work		
Candidate does not fully complete the awarding body's cover sheet that is attached to their worked submitted for formal assessment	<i>Cover sheet is checked to ensure it is fully completed before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</i>	Subject Lecturers
Keeping materials secure		
Candidates work between formal supervised sessions is not securely stored	<i>Records confirm Subject lecturers are aware of and follow current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments</i> <i>Regular monitoring/internal audit ensures Subject lecturer use of appropriate secure storage</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams, Head of IT and Subject Lecturers
Adequate secure storage not available to Subject lecturer	<i>Records confirm adequate/sufficient secure storage is available to Subject lecturer prior to the start of the course</i> <i>Alternative secure storage sourced where required</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams, Head of IT and Subject Lecturers
Task marking – externally assessed components		
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an acceptable reason	<i>Awarding body guidance is sought to determine if alternative assessment arrangements can be made for the candidate</i> <i>If not, eligibility for special consideration is explored and a request submitted to the awarding body where appropriate</i>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an unacceptable reason	<i>The candidate is marked absent on the attendance register</i>	Subject Lecturer
Task marking – internally assessed components		

A candidate submits little or no work	<p><i>Where a candidate submits no work, the candidate is recorded as absent when marks are submitted to the awarding body</i></p> <p><i>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 assessment criteria a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body</i></p>	Subject Lecturer
A candidate is unable to finish their work for unforeseen reason	<p><i>Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (section 5), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for shortfall in work</i></p>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Subject Lecturers
The work of a candidate is lost or damaged	<p><i>Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (section 8), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for lost or damaged work</i></p>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager
Candidate malpractice is discovered	<p><i>Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (section 9 Malpractice) are followed</i></p> <p><i>Investigation and reporting procedures in the current JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments are followed</i></p> <p><i>Appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are also followed</i></p>	Head of Centre, Principals, Vice Principals and Exams' Manager
A teacher marks the work of their own child	<p><i>A conflict of interest is declared by informing the awarding body that a teacher is teaching their own child at the start of the course</i></p> <p><i>Marked work of said child is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not</i></p>	Head of Centre, Principals, Vice Principals and Exams Manager
An extension to the deadline for submission of marks is required for a legitimate reason	<p><i>Awarding body is contacted to determine if an extension can be granted</i></p> <p><i>Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ guidance on non-examination assessments, to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for non-examination assessment extension</i></p>	Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager

<p>After submission of marks, it is discovered that the wrong task was given to candidates</p>	<p><i>Awarding body is contacted for guidance</i></p> <p><i>Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ guidance on non-examination assessments, to determine eligibility and the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for candidates</i></p>	<p>Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager</p>
<p>candidate wishes to appeal/request a review of the marks awarded for their work by their teacher</p>	<p><i>Candidates are informed of the marks they have been awarded for their work prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body</i></p> <p><i>Records confirm candidates have been informed of their marks</i></p> <p><i>Candidates are informed that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process</i></p> <p><i>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 manager for the submission of marks</i></p> <p><i>Through preparation, candidates are made aware of the Centre's internal appeals procedures 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</i></p>	<p>Curriculum Leadership Teams and Exams' Manager</p>
<p>Deadline for submitting work for formal assessment not met by candidate</p>	<p><i>Records confirm deadlines given and understood by candidates at the start of the course</i></p> <p><i>Candidates confirm/record deadlines known and understood</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p>Curriculum Leadership Teams and Subject Lecturers</p>

<p>Deadline for submitting marks and samples of candidates work ignored by subject lecturer</p>	<p><i>Internal/external deadlines are published at the start of each academic year</i></p> <p><i>Reminders are issued through Directors as deadlines approach</i></p> <p><i>Records confirm deadlines known and understood by Subject lecturers</i></p> <p><i>Where appropriate, internal disciplinary procedures are followed</i></p>	<p>Curriculum Leadership Teams</p>
<p>Subject lecturer long term absence during the marking period</p>	<p><i>See Centre's exam contingency plan (Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle)</i></p>	